DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 031 656 AC 005 052

By-Quattlebaum, Charles A.

Federal Educational Policies, Programs and Proposals. A Survey and Handbook. Part I: Background, Issues, Relevant Considerations.

Library of Congress, Washington, D.C. Legislative Reference Service.

Pub Date Dec 68

Note-177p.; Part I of a three part handbook.

Available from-Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. ($.75).

EDRS Price MF-$0.75 HC Not Available from EDRS.

Descriptors-*Educational Policy, Federal Government, *Federal Legislation, Foundation Programs, *Government Role, *Historical Reviews, *Private Agencies, Private Schools, Racial Integration, Training

Identifiers-National Science Foundation, Office of Education

This, the first of a three part handbook, seeks to make available to the Congress a compilation, analysis, and summary of certain basic information needed for legislative decision on educational issues that come before Congress. Specifically it (1) summarizes the evolution of Federal policies in education 1777-1960 and congressional enactments concerning education and training; (2) discusses the history, organization, and functions of the U.S. Office of Education and of the National Science Foundation; (3) reviews the recommendations of ad hoc advisory commissions, 1929-1967, concerning Federal educational policies; and (4) sets forth the positions of currently active organizations and agencies, governmental and nongovernmental, concerning the Federal role in education. Three areas of controversy are seen: the extent of Federal control over local education, Federal aid to nonpublic schools; and racial integration in the schools. (dm)

ED031656

AC 005 052

90th Congress, 2d Session - - - - - - House Document No. 398

FEDERAL EDUCATIONAL POLICIES, PROGRAMS AND PROPOSALS

A SURVEY AND HANDBOOK

Part I

BACKGROUND; ISSUES; RELEVANT CONSIDERATIONS

PREPARED IN
The Legislative Reference Service
OF
THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
BY
CHARLES A. QUATTLEBAUM
Specialist in Education

DECEMBER 1968

Printed for the use of the Committee on Education and Labor
CARL D. PERKINS, *Chairman*

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
20-815 O WASHINGTON : 1968

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington, D.C. 20402 - Price 75 cents (paper cover)

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

CARL D. PERKINS, Kentucky, *Chairman*

EDITH GREEN, Oregon
FRANK THOMPSON, Jr., New Jersey
JOHN H. DENT, Pennsylvania
ROMAN C. PUCINSKI, Illinois
DOMINICK V. DANIELS, New Jersey
JOHN BRADEMAS, Indiana
JAMES G. O'HARA, Michigan
HUGH L. CAREY, New York
AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS, California
SAM GIBBONS, Florida
WILLIAM D. FORD, Michigan
WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY, Maine
PATSY T. MINK, Hawaii
JAMES H. SCHEUER, New York
LLOYD MEEDS, Washington
PHILLIP BURTON, California
CARL ALBERT, Oklahoma

WILLIAM H. AYRES, Ohio
ALBERT H. QUIE, Minnesota
JOHN M. ASHBROOK, Ohio
ALPHONZO BELL, California
OGDEN R. REID, New York
EDWARD J. GURNEY, Florida
JOHN N. ERLENBORN, Illinois
WILLIAM J. SCHERLE, Iowa
JOHN DELLENBACK, Oregon
MARVIN L. ESCH, Michigan
EDWIN D. ESHLEMAN, Pennsylvania
JAMES C. GARDNER, North Carolina
WILLIAM A. STEIGER, Wisconsin
JAMES M. COLLINS, Texas

H. Con. Res. 763

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there shall be printed as a House document a survey and handbook entitled "Federal Educational Policies, Programs, and Proposals" and that two thousand copies be printed for the use of the Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives.

Attest:

W. Pat Jennings,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Attest:

Francis R. Valeo,
Secretary of the Senate.

CHAIRMAN'S PREFACE

The Federal role in education was long a controversial topic in America. While it can still generate considerable debate, the issue has dwindled to a question of how large the role must be. The basic question of whether there is, in fact, a Federal role has long since been settled in the affirmative.

In some respects, it is strange that the issue ever became controversial at all. Federal involvement in education is not a new, wild-eyed, or visionary scheme. The principle was established almost before the ink was dry on our Declaration of Independence. In 1777, the Federal Government began direct participation in educational programs, with instruction of military personnel in mathematics.

From that modest beginning, the Federal role has grown to such a point that in 1967 the President declared that the total Federal expenditure for education for the fiscal year 1968 would amount to about $11 billion.

Although the history of Federal participation in educational programs is long, the monetary outlay did not reach anything like its present proportion until the decade of the 1960's.

Estimated outlays in fiscal 1969, for instance, represent an increase of 200 percent over 1965, and a 500-percent increase over 1961. It has became a matter of settled Federal policy that investment in education is essential for the social and economic progress of the Nation.

This study, undertaken by Dr. Charles Quattlebaum, of the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, is an exploration of the scope of our Federal educational policies, programs, and proposals today. It is a necessarily much-broadened updating of earlier studies made by Dr. Quattlebaum, beginning in 1950 and continuing to 1960.

As such, it is a valuable document for the use of members of the Committee on Education and Labor and for the Congress in general. It is probably a unique document in that nowhere else is information relative to the education and training programs of all Federal agencies brought together in one handbook.

Carl D. Perkins,
Chairman, Committee on Education and Labor.

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

SEPTEMBER 9, 1968.

This study of Federal educational policies, programs, and proposals was undertaken for the Committee on Education and Labor in response to a request received in the Legislative Reference Service from the chairman, the Honorable Carl D. Perkins. The study was carried out and the report prepared by Charles A. Quattlebaum, specialist in education on the staff of the Service. He was assisted by Emily C. Hammond, education analyst.

To some extent this report represents a revision and updating of an earlier one prepared by the same author and published in three volumes as committee prints of the Committee on Education and Labor in 1960. In view of the many developments in Federal educational policies and programs in recent years, however, this revision necessarily is more in the nature of a new report.

The primary purpose of the present study is to make readily available to the members of the Committee on Education and Labor, and to the Congress in general, a compilation, analysis and summary of certain basic information needed for informed legislative decision on educational issues that come before the Congress. A secondary purpose is to make available to members of the committee and other officers of the Federal Government, and to other interested persons, a handbook of information concerning the educational and training programs of all Federal departments and independent agencies.

The preparation of this report would not have been possible without the generous cooperation of several hundred persons on the staffs of Federal agencies and private organizations. These persons have contributed information in various ways, such as by supplying published materials, engaging in conferences with the author, and preparing memoranda which he has quoted, edited or otherwise adapted for the purpose of this report. The assistance of these persons is gratefully acknowledged.

This document is intended for use mainly as a handbook rather than for continuous reading. The detailed table of contents is designed to serve as a brief of the report, and to facilitate its use as a reference work.

LESTER S. JAYSON,
Director, Legislative Reference Service.

CONTENTS

Page

Chapter 1. Introduction 1
- A. Importance of education, and of the Federal role in it, during the space age 1
- B. Controversy over the Federal role 3
- C. Purpose of this report 7
- D. Some findings from earlier studies 8

Chapter 2. Evolution of Federal policies in education, 1777–1960 13
- A. Introduction and chronological summary 13
  - 1. Constitutional background 13
  - 2. Beginning and growth of Federal concern 15
- B. Federal support to education in the States 17
  - 1. Early Federal land and monetary grants policy 17
  - 2. Nautical education 18
  - 3. The land-grant colleges 18
  - 4. Experiment stations and extension service 18
  - 5. Vocational education below college grade 19
  - 6. 4–H and other clubs 19
  - 7. Depression relief measures 20
  - 8. Wartime activities 21
  - 9. Aid to federally affected localities 22
  - 10. Loans for college buildings 23
  - 11. Surplus property for educational institutions 23
  - 12. National school lunch program 24
  - 13. Aeronautical education (civil aeronautics) 24
  - 14. The National Defense Education Act of 1958 25
  - 15. Other aids to education in the States 25
- C. Federally operated educational programs 26
  - 1. Programs of the Armed Forces 26
  - 2. Implication of Armed Forces wartime programs 28
  - 3. Education in special Federal jurisdictions 28
  - 4. Merchant marine training 29
  - 5. Inservice training of Government employees 29
- D. Federal educational programs for special groups 30
  - 1. Education for veterans 30
  - 2. Vocational rehabilitation of physically disabled persons (excepting veterans) 32
  - 3. Training of nurses 32
  - 4. Training of personnel in State and local public health work 32
  - 5. Training of scientists 33
  - 6. Apprenticeship and other industrial training 33
  - 7. Education of other special groups 34
- E. Federal advisory, research, and administrative services in education 34
- F. Federal educational activities in cooperation with other countries 34
  - 1. Bilateral programs 35
  - 2. Participation in programs of international organizations 36
  - 3. Reeducation and educational reconstruction 36

Chapter 3. Congressional enactments concerning education and training, 1961–66 37
- A. 87th Congress 37
  - 1. First session, 1961 37
  - 2. Second session, 1962 38

Chapter 3. Congressional enactments concerning education and training, 1961–66—Continued

Page
B. 88th Congress 39
  1. First session, 1963 39
  2. Second session, 1964 41
C. 89th Congress 42
  1. First session, 1965 42
  2. Second session, 1966 45
Chapter 4. History, organization and functions of the (U.S.) Office of Education and of the National Science Foundation 49
A. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare 49
  1. Establishment, position, and basic purpose 49
  2. Growth of activities 50
  3. Present organization and functions 53
B. National Science Foundation 63
  1. Origin and development of programs 63
  2. Present organization and functions 66
Chapter 5. Recommendations of ad hoc advisory commissions (December 1929–March 1967) 69
A. Governmental advisory commissions 69
  1. The National Advisory Committee on Education (1929) 69
  2. The (U.S.) Advisory Committee on Education (1936) 70
  3. The National Resources Planning Board (1939) 71
  4. The President's Commission on Higher Education (1946) 72
  5. The (Hoover) Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government (1947) 73
  6. The (Hoover) Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government (1953) 74
  7. The Commission on Intergovernmental Relations (1953) 76
  8. The White House Conference on Education (1955) 78
    (*a*) Report of the President's Committee for the White House Conference on Education 79
    (*b*) Report of the White House Conference on Education 80
    (*c*) Reports of State and territorial conferences on education 80
  9. The President's Committee on Education Beyond the High School (1956) 81
  10. Other governmental advisory groups before 1960 82
  11. The White House Conference on Aging (1961) 84
  12. The Kennedy Task Force Committee on Education, 1961 86
  13. Panel of Consultants on Vocational Education, 1962 87
  14. Advisory Panel on Educational Statistics, 1963 88
  15. The White House Conference on Education, 1965 88
  16. The White House Conference "To Fulfill These Rights," 1966 89
  17. The Committee To Review Relationships between Federal Agencies and Private Organizations, 1967 90
B. Nongovernmental advisory groups 91
  1. The National Conference on the Financing of Education (1933) 91
  2. The American Youth Commission (1940) 92
  3. The National Committee on Coordination in Secondary Education (1941) 93
  4. The Interstate Committee on Postwar Reconstruction and Development (1944) 93
  5. The Educational Policies Commission; and the Problems and Policies Committee (joint study, 1945) 94
  6. The Commission on Implications of Armed Services Educational Programs (1947) 95
  7. The Commission on Financing Higher Education (1952) 95
  8. The National Citizens Commission for the Public Schools (1954) 96
  9. The Rockefeller Panel on Education (1958) 97
  10. The President's Commission on National Goals, 1960 97

Page

Chapter 6. Policies and actions advocated by active governmental bodies and private organizations 99
- A. Principal U.S. Government educational agencies 100
  - 1. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare 100
  - 2. National Science Foundation 102
- B. Other governmental bodies (commissions, councils, et cetera) 105
  - 1. Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations 105
  - 2. Board of Foreign Scholarships 106
  - 3. Commission on Civil Rights 106
  - 4. Council on International Educational and Cultural Affairs 106
  - 5. Federal Council for Science and Technology 107
  - 6. National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children 107
  - 7. National Review Board for the Center for Cultural and Technical Interchange between East and West 108
  - 8. Panel on Educational Innovation 108
  - 9. President's Council on Aging 108
  - 10. President's Committee on Mental Retardation 109
  - 11. President's Science Advisory Committee 109
  - 12. U.S. Advisory Commission on Information 110
  - 13. U.S. Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs 110
  - 14. U.S. National Commission for UNESCO 111
- C. Organizations of State and local school officials 111
  - 1. American Association of School Administrators 111
  - 2. Council of Chief State School Officers 112
  - 3. Department of Elementary Principals (National Education Association) 113
  - 4. National Association of Secondary School Principals 114
  - 5. National Association of State Boards of Education 114
  - 6. National Association of State Directors of Vocational Education 115
  - 7. National School Boards Association 115
- D. National political parties 117
  - 1. Democratic Party 117
  - 2. Republican Party 118
- E. Organized labor 119
  - 1. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations 119
- F. Farmers' organizations 121
  - 1. American Farm Bureau Federation 121
  - 2. National Farmers Union 121
  - 3. National Grange 123
- G. Industrial and trade organizations 123
  - 1. Chamber of Commerce of the United States 123
  - 2. National Association of Manufacturers 125
- H. Churches and church-affiliated organizations 125
  - 1. American Association for Jewish Education 125
  - 2. American Lutheran Church 126
  - 3. Americans United for Separation of Church and State 127
  - 4. Friends Committee on National Legislation 127
  - 5. General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists 128
  - 6. General Conference of the Methodist Church 128
  - 7. Lutheran Church in America 129
  - 8. Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod 129
  - 9. National Council for Jewish Education 129
  - 10. National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A. 130
  - 11. Southern Baptist Convention 130
  - 12. United Presbyterian Church in the United States of America 131
  - 13. United States Catholic Conference (USCC) 131
- I. Women's organizations 132
  - 1. American Association of University Women 132
  - 2. General Federation of Women's Clubs 132

Chapter 6. Policies and actions advocated by active governmental bodies and private organizations—Continued

Page
J. Educational associations 133
  1. American Association for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation 133
  2. American Association for Higher Education 133
  3. American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education 134
  4. American Association of Junior Colleges 134
  5. American Association of University Professors 135
  6. American Council on Education 135
  7. American Federation of Teachers 136
  8. American Library Association 137
  9. American Vocational Association 137
  10. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development 138
  11. Association of American Colleges 138
  12. Association of Classroom Teachers of the National Education Association 139
  13. Association of School Business Officials of the United States and Canada 140
  14. Association of State Colleges and Universities 140
  15. Council for Exceptional Children 141
  16. Department of Elementary-Kindergarten-Nursery Education (National Education Association) 142
  17. Educational Policies Commission 142
  18. Institute of International Education 143
  19. Modern Language Association of America 143
  20. National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges 144
  21. National Citizens Committee for the Public Schools 144
  22. National Congress of Parents and Teachers 144
  23. National Council on Schoolhouse Construction 145
  24. National Education Association of the United States 145
  25. Philosophy of Education Society 146
K. Other organizations 146
  1. American Association for the Advancement of Science 146
  2. American Bar Association 147
  3. American Legion 147
  4. American Medical Association 148
  5. American Psychiatric Association 149
  6. National Association for the Advancement of Colored People 149
  7. National Urban League 153
Chapter 7. Summary of part I 155
  A. Issues and relevant considerations 155
  B. Development of Federal policies and programs, 1777–1960 155
  C. Major enactments concerning education and training, 1961–66 158
  D. The Office of Education and the National Science Foundation 159
  E. Recommendations of ad hoc advisory commissions (1929–67) 161
  F. Positions of currently active governmental bodies and private organizations 163
Appendix—Texts of the Democratic and Republican party platform planks on education, 1968 166

FEDERAL EDUCATIONAL POLICIES, PROGRAMS, AND PROPOSALS

Part I. Background: Issues, Relevant Considerations

CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION

A. IMPORTANCE OF EDUCATION, AND OF THE FEDERAL ROLE IN IT, DURING THE SPACE AGE

Statements by President Johnson in 1967 and 1968 have climaxed nearly two decades of expressed emphasis by Presidents of the United States concerning the importance of education, and of the Federal role in it, during the present age of space exploration.

In 1949, at a time of growing international tensions, President Truman declared that:

> Education is our first line of defense. In the conflict of principle and policy which divides the world today, America's hope, our hope, the hope of the world is in education. * * * Education is the most important task before us.[1]

A few years later some prominent Americans began to point out that the Communists had committed themselves to education as the basis of competition with Western democracy. For example, following a trip to the U.S.S.R., in 1956, former Senator William Benton said:

> The Communists from the earliest days gave up butter for guns, but they gave up meat for education.[1a]

On April 4, 1957, President Eisenhower admonished the Nation that:

> Our schools are strong points in our national defense. Our schools are more important than our Nike batteries, more necessary than our radar warning nets, and more powerful even than the energy of the atom.[2]

Six months later, on October 4, 1957, the world held its breath and turned its eyes skyward to see the first manmade moon—the first Russian sputnik. Interpreting the significance of this historic event, the chancellor of one of our great State universities[3] declared that:

> The message which this little ball carries to Americans, if they would but stop and listen, is that in the last half of the 20th century * * * nothing is as important as the trained and educated mind. This sphere * * * states more dramatically than ever before that the future of the 20th century lies in the hands of those who have placed education and its Siamese twin—research—in the position of priority.

Upon the return of a group of American educators from a study of education in the Soviet Union in 1958, the U.S. Commissioner of Education, Lawrence G. Derthick, as spokesman for the group, remarked:

---

[1] Public Papers of the Presidents, Harry S. Truman, 1949, p. 167.

[1a] NEA Journal, May 1956.

[2] Public Papers of the Presidents, Dwight D. Eisenhower, 1957, p. 265.

[3] Dr. Franklin D. Murphy, chancellor of the University of Kansas. Address before the American Council on Education, in Washington, D.C., Oct. 11, 1957.

> What we have seen has amazed us in one outstanding particular. * * * Everywhere we saw indication after indication of what we could only conclude amounted to a total commitment to education.[4]

On July 13, 1959, the Russians announced another achievement in science—the safe return to earth of two dogs they had sent into space in a 4,850-pound ballistic rocket. They also said instruments in the rocket were parachuted to earth after successfully making recordings of conditions in outer space.[5]

On September 13, 1959, an 858-pound Soviet sphere, loaded with scientific instruments and Russian flags, hit the moon. The strike was conceded by British and American scientists who had tracked the rocket by its radio signals. They accepted this as proof that Soviet ballistic missiles could be fired with deadly accuracy against American cities.[6] Then on April 12, 1961, came the news that the Russians had sent a man into space; he had orbited the earth, and been returned safely to his homeland.

In an atmosphere of urgency created by public utterances and events such as these, and stimulated by America's own fast-developing space program, the American people undertook a reevaluation of their educational policies and activities, including those of the Federal, State, and local governments. Under our system of representative government, Congress has participated in this reevaluation.

In reference to the effects of Russian and American space exploration upon education in the United States, on September 26, 1966, Vice President Humphrey said:

> I think we must admit that the first sputnik (Russian artificial satellite) gave us a good swift kick in our complacency concerning the quality of American education.
>
> * * * * * * *
>
> In the last 3 years alone, we have more than doubled our Federal investments in education.
>
> * * * * * * *
>
> The space age has placed a premium on knowledge and education. It has also forced us to adopt higher standards throughout our society.[7]

Upon signing "four landmark health and education bills" on November 3, 1966, President Johnson remarked:

> Today, thanks to our great Congress, American boys and girls can look forward to the future with renewed hope. We have made the greatest national commitment to education in our history through our Federal Government.[8]

In his message to Congress on health and education on February 28, 1967, President Johnson declared that:

> Nothing is more fundamental to all we seek than our programs in health and education.[8a]

In signing the 1968 amendments to higher education and vocational education laws on October 16, 1968, he said:

> When we advance learning, free men enter a new world of opportunity and expression.[8b]

---

[4] Address before the National Press Club in Washington, D.C.

[5] Washington Star, July 13, 1959, p. 1.

[6] Washington News, Sept. 14, 1959, p. 3.

[7] Office of the Vice President, Washington, D.C., press release: Remarks of Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey (at) San Fernando Valley State College, Calif., Sept. 26, 1966.

[8] Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents, vol. 2, No. 44, Nov. 7, 1966.

[8a] Ibid., vol. 3, No. 9, March 6, 1967.

[8b] Ibid., vol. 4, No. 42, October 11, 1968.

Particularly within the last decade, the Congress has shown an increasing interest in education. The growing congressional concern with education has been indicated by the number of relevant bills introduced and the number and importance of those enacted, by the extent of discussion of education and training in committee hearings and on the floor of the House and Senate, by the quantity of material concerning education inserted in the Congressional Record, and, perhaps most significantly, by the great increase in appropriations for educational and training purposes.

Pending in the 90th Congress at the time of its adjournment were various bills which, if enacted, would affect education and training in the United States and in other countries. In view of the importance of education, and of the Federal role in it, during this age of the exploration of space, it is reasonable to expect that the introduction of such bills will continue. The need of the Congress for information such as this report undertakes to supply, as a part of the basis for the consideration of such legislation, presumably will be great.

B. CONTROVERSY OVER THE FEDERAL ROLE

What the Federal Government should or should not be doing in the field of education and training has been a subject of continuing controversy for many decades. From time to time the Congress has, through legislation, resolved some of the subsidiary issues, only to be confronted almost immediately with new ones. The overall issue, namely how and to what extent shall the Federal Government participate in education, remains continually before the Congress.

The extraordinary enlargement of the Federal role in education within the last 4 years has precipitated an enormous amount of literature dealing with various aspects of the subject. This is understandable in view of the nature and scope of the new Federal programs and the great increase in Federal expenditures for educational and training purposes. In 1963 the House Special Subcommittee on Education reported that:

> Using the term "education" in a broad sense, it may be said that the Government's educational activities cost $2.2 billion a year, based on figures, for the most part, for fiscal year 1962.[9]

Only 3 years later, in 1966, the Bureau of the Budget reported that—

> The Government will spend an estimated $8.4 billion in 1967 for all education, training and allied programs broadly defined. * * * New obligational authority in 1967 for all the education, training and related programs will total $10.2 billion. * * *"[10]

In his study of the Role of the Federal Government in Education, published in 1966,[11] Dr. Sidney W. Tiedt pointed out that the budget of the Office of Education alone had become bigger than that of the Department of Commerce, Interior, Justice or Labor. Yet the Office of Education is only one of a number of Federal agencies administering educational and training programs.

---

[9] The Federal Government and Education. 88th Cong., 1st sess. H. Doc. No. 159, p. 115.

[10] Special Analyses, Budget of the United States, fiscal year 1967, p. 82.

[11] New York, Oxford University Press, p. 200.

Broad study of the literature of the last several years relating to controversy over the Federal role in education has revealed that it has been concerned mainly with the questions of (1) Federal control over education, (2) Federal aid to nonpublic schools, and (3) racial integration in schools.

Involved in the question of Federal control over education are such subsidiary issues as the retention of the traditional neighborhood public school, Federal aid to the establishment of large educational "parks," and Federal encouragement of the busing of pupils from so-called "ghetto" to suburban schools.

The issue of Federal aid to nonpublic schools also involves subsidiary questions, such as whether this aid would be going to the school or to the child. The aid-to-nonpublic-schools issue applies mainly to Roman Catholic parochial schools, since they enroll about 90 percent of the total number of pupils attending nonpublic elementary and secondary schools.

The issue of racial integration in schools is now largely concerned with the questions of "de facto" segregation and creation of a racial "balance" in schools.

Underlying such questions as these is the basic issue as to whether the traditional pattern of State and local control over education should be preserved. Many persons have expressed grave concern over what they consider Federal encroachment on the constitutional rights of the States and localities to administer public education without Federal interference. In this connection it appears noteworthy that probably no later action by any branch of the Federal Government has affected the Federal role in education more than the Supreme Court's desegregation decision of May 17, 1954. Accepted as the "law of the land" by most, but denounced by some as representing Federal control over education and an unconstitutional usurpation of legislative power, the desegregation decision has markedly influenced the development of Federal policies and programs.

A full discussion of the continuing controversy over the Federal role in education and its subsidiary issues before Congress would be voluminous, and will not be undertaken in this report. The following quotations,[12] considered together, indicate the nature of disagreement regarding some recent congressional enactments and pending proposals in this field.

CONCERNING THE QUESTION OF FEDERAL CONTROL OVER EDUCATION

(Selected quotations together indicative of the nature of the continuing controversy)

Dr. John Howard (president of Rockford College, Rockford, Ill.): "The * * * fallacy [that] Federal aid does not mean Federal control * * * is stark nonsense."[13]

Dr. J. Gaylen Saylor (president, Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development): "Federal Tests Mean Federal Control."[14]

Fred M. Hechinger (education editor, New York Times): "If education is to be the heart and the pumping station of the cities' rebirth, then it is an idle hope that the task can be accomplished by mimeographed directives from schoolboards to classrooms." [15]

---

[12] Excerpts from "The Changing Federal Role in Education," a digest of factual and critical literature relating to Federal education and training laws and their administration, 1963–66. Prepared in the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress by C. A. Quattlebaum, Oct. 12, 1966. Typescript. 251 pages.

[13] "The Pitfalls of Federal Aid to Education." Human Events, (Washington, D.C.), Jan. 8, 1966, p. 8.

[14] "Federal Tests Mean Federal Control." *Nation's Schools*, February 1966, p. 48.

Arnold Bloom (editor, American School and University): "Federal funds are beneficial, but only as a supplement to local financial support. There is the ever present danger of sitting back and letting the fellow who pays the bills make the decisions." [16]

Josephine Ripley (staff correspondent of the Christian Science Monitor): (In answer to one of the questions asked U.S. Education Commissioner Harold Howe in an interview, he said): "I would agree that we have an 'unprecedented role' in the sense that the Federal Government is called upon to play a larger role in education than ever before. But this is not what some people consider a controlling role." [17]

American Education (reporting interview with Francis Keppel, former U.S. Commissioner of Education): "Mr. KEPPEL. I suppose one might foresee a time when the Federal role in some respects of education would increase to the point where you would wonder whether it could be called a junior partnership." [18]

James J. Kilpatrick (columnist): "The groundwork quietly is being laid for effective Federal control of the textbooks and library materials used in the Nation's public schools." [19]

Robert E. McKay (chairman, NEA Legislative Commission): "The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 * * * marks the assumption by the Federal Government of its appropriate and long-overdue role in assuring adequate educational opportunity for all American children." [20]

U.S. News & World Report (news article): "There are complaints that the schools are being used (by the Federal Government) to promote social goals, at the expense of basic education." [21]

William S. Paley (chairman, Columbia Broadcasting System): "Neither our history nor our character as a people supports the fear that Federal aid to education means Federal control of it." [22]

CONCERNING THE ISSUE OF FEDERAL AID TO NONPUBLIC SCHOOLS

(Selected quotations together indicative of the nature of the continuing controversy)

John L. Buford (educational consultant, past president, National Education Association): "Every new Federal law from (the) NDEA in 1958 to the last Act of 1965 has opened the door a bit wider for public funds to go to nonpublic schools. Look out for what will follow if we fold our hands in complacency." [23]

Dr. Edgar Fuller (executive secretary, council of chief State school officers): "The Federal Government is today moving into a position from which it might eventually undermine the fiscal base of the public schools. * * * Tax support for a multiplicity of private schools will undermine both the tax base and the community support that public education must have to meet its obligations to the people it must serve." [24]

Life magazine (editorial): "[President] Johnson's contribution is a practical formula for getting aid to students instead of to schools, thereby skirting the whole (aid-to-parochial-schools) debate." [25]

J. Paul Williams (professor of religion, Mount Holyoke College, Mass.): "As related to Government financial aid to sectarian schools the battle around the wall of separation of church and state promises to continue for many years to come."[26]

---

[15] "Schoolmen Asked for Trouble." *Nation's Schools,* February 1966, p. 49.

[16] "Spending More, But Enjoying it Less." *American School and University,* April 1966.

[17] "U.S. Schools. Growing Federal Role Seen—But Not Control." *Christian Science Monitor,* July 13, 1966, p. 13.

[18] "An Interview With Francis Keppel" (during his final day as Assistant Secretary for Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, May 20, 1966), *American Education,* July–August 1966, p. 11.

[19] "Remaking Our School Books." *Washington Star,* Sept. 4, 1966, p. C–1.

[20] "The President's Program: 'A New Commitment to Quality and Equality in Education.' " Phi Delta Kappan, May 1965, p. 427.

[21] "A Federal Hand on Local Schools." U.S. News & World Report, Nov. 8, 1965, p. 54.

[22] "The Most Priceless Resource." New York, Columbia Broadcasting System, 1963. 15 pages.

[23] "At the Crossroads of the Church-State Issue." Summary statement delivered at Atlantic City, N.J., Feb. 15, 1966, during the annual meeting of the American Association of School Administrators. Processed. 41 pages.

[24] "At the Crossroads of the Church-State Issue." Address delivered at Atlantic City, N.J., Feb. 15, 1966, during the annual meeting of the American Association of School Superintendents. Processed. 4 pages.

[25] "New Leadership in Education." Life Magazine, Jan. 29, 1965, p. 4.

Gerald Grant (Washington Post staff writer): "The new Federal school aid program will spur 'monumental changes' in the Nation's Catholic school system, its chief spokesman (Rt. Rev. Msgr. Frederick G. Hochwalt) believes."[27]

Church and State (news article): "Editor Lowell, (editor-in-chief of Church and State) called attention to the fact that the (Elementary and Secondary Education) Act circumscribes State constitutions."[28]

William C. Strasser (assistant director of personnel, Montgomery County, Md., Public Schools): "New Federal legislation enhances the potential of public education as opposed to nonpublic education (and) calls for a reexamination of the role of nonpublic schools."[29]

Virgil C. Blum, S.J. (chairman, Department of Political Science, Marquette University, Milwaukee, Wis.): "The central issue of the (Federal) aid-to-education debate is freedom of religion in education."[30]

Russell Kirk (author): "The better * * * approach (to aid to church-connected schools) is through the amendment of State and local, rather than Federal, provisions for school financing."[31]

George R. La Noue (author): "The strategy of supporters of public aid to religious schools (is) to shift the responsibility of financial support for all education away from State and local government to the Federal Government."[32]

Concerning the Issue of Racial Integration in Schools—Including De Facto Segregation and Creation of Racial "Balance" in Schools

(Selected quotations together indicative of the nature of the continuing controversy)

David Lawrence (columnist): "Resentment and bitterness are emerging in different parts of the country—North as well as South—over the efforts of the Federal Government to impose 'racial balance' in the public schools."[33]

Monroe W. Karmin (writer): "Federal officials now favor end to tradition of neighborhood school; new education commissioner calls for busing; plazas; suburbanites are alarmed."[34]

Washington Post (editorial): "The furor over the withholding of $30 million from Chicago's public schools and the subsequent release of the funds is a warning of grave dangers ahead unless the new system of Federal aid to education is handled with the utmost care."[35]

Hubert H. Humphrey (Vice President): "The Vocational Education Act of 1963 is a major step in this direction (of granting the special educational services that must be made available to those with special problems)."[36]

New York Times (news article): "Former President Eisenhower * * * says the Supreme Court's 1954 decision outlawing public school segregation 'is morally and legally correct.' "[37]

---

[26] "Church and State: Is the Wall of Separation Rising or Falling?" School and Society, Feb. 20, 1965, p. 113.

[27] "Hochwalt Sees Broad Catholic School Change." Washington Post, April 23, 1965, p. A–6.

[28] "Americans United Expresses Concern About New Elementary Education Act." Church and State, July–August 1965, p. 12.

[29] "The Education Act of 1965: Implications for Nonpublic Schools." Phi Delta Kappan, September 1965, p. 24.

[30] "Freedom in Education: Federal Aid for All Children." New York, Doubleday and Co., Inc., 1965. Ch. II, Freedom in Education, p. 49.

[31] "From the Academy. Aid to Church-Connected Schools." National Review, Dec. 29, 1964, p. 1146.

[32] "Public Funds for Parochial Schools." New York, National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A., Department of Religious Liberty, 1963. Pages 38–39.

[33] " 'Racial Balance' in Education." Washington Star, Mar. 21, 1966, p. A–11.

[34] "Federal Officials Now Favor End to Tradition of Neighborhood School. New Education Commissioner Calls for Busing, 'Plazas' Suburbanites are Alarmed. His Only Weapon: U.S. Cash." Wall Street Journal, Aug. 12, 1966, p. 12.

[35] "School Fund Furor." Washington Post, Oct. 8, 1965, p. A–18.

[36] "Racial Integration in Education." (Introluction to the book, "Integration vs. Segregation: The Crisis in Our Schools as Viewed by 17 Outstanding Commentators." compiled and edited by Hubert H. Humphrey) School and Society, Mar. 7, 1964, p. 99.

[37] "Eisenhower Finds High Court Correct in '54 School Ruling." New York Times, Oct. 10, 1963, p. 25.

The perennial controversy over Federal policies in education indicated by the foregoing quotations entails a continuing congressional need for information on what every Federal agency is doing in this field.

That the Federal Government has been and is now very much concerned with education is evidenced by the existence of hundreds of Federal educational programs or activities. But to acknowledge the existence of this concern, as expressed in these activities, is not to say how or to what extent the Federal Government should participate in the administration or in the support of education. This remains a question continually before Congress and before all thinking Americans.

C. PURPOSE OF THIS REPORT

The primary object of the present report is to make readily available to the Committee on Education and Labor, and to the Congress in general, a compilation, analysis, and summary of certain basic information needed for legislative decision on educational issues that come before the Congress.

Particularly, this study is designed to afford a part of the basis for congressional determination of future policies of the Federal Government respecting the establishment and administration of Federal educational programs. As is shown in detail later in the report, educational programs and activities are scattered throughout the structure of the Federal Government. These activities vary widely in nature and degree of being "educational."

This report assumes that the Committee on Education and Labor needs several types of information concerning existing Federal educational policies, programs, and issues in order to determine new policies in this field. Determining these policies involves answering such specific questions as the following: (1) What new educational programs, if any, should be initiated? (2) What should be the relationship of these to the established activities? (3) What changes, if any, in the administration of the older programs should be made? (4) How could or should the various programs be coordinated? and (5) What other matters bear upon legislation affecting Federal educational activities?

Obviously, all of the information needed for congressional decision on proposed national legislation affecting education cannot be compressed into a single report. The present study presents some of the basic data necessary for congressional consideration of the broader policies in this field. Reports on some of the specific educational issues have been prepared in the Legislative Reference Service, and studies of other specific legislative proposals in this field are pending in the Service.

Somewhat more precisely, the principal purposes of this study are the following:

In part I: (1) To trace the evolution of Federal policies in education; (2) to summarize recent Federal legislation concerning education and training; (3) to outline the history and describe the organization and functions of the two Federal agencies which have education as their primary concern; (4) to review the recommendations of ad hoc advisory commissions, 1929–67, concerning Federal policies in education; and (5) to set forth the positions of currently active organizations and agencies, governmental and nongovernmental, concerning the Federal role in education.

In part II: (1) To survey the educational activities administered by Federal agencies; (2) to describe the programs individually; and (3) to summarize these activities, including data on financial obligations for the respective programs as well as general descriptive information.

In part III: To analyze and classify the Federal educational programs according to several categories; namely (1) methods of administration, (2) levels of education concerned, (3) geographic areas affected, and (4) number and type of persons affected—setting forth in this connection such information as should be useful to the Congress in considering similarities and relationships of the various programs and possible measures for coordinating some of them. Finally, to discuss some of the pending legislative issues and conclusions from this study.

D. SOME FINDINGS FROM EARLIER STUDIES

Certain earlier studies have revealed the general scope of Federal educational activities, and other information concerning them, at the time the studies were made. A brief summary of some of the principal findings follows:

In 1931 the National Advisory Committee on Education, appointed by President Herbert Hoover, reported that—

> Few people are aware of the extent to which the Federal Government is engaged in educational activities.
>
> * * * * * * *
>
> It is not possible to list accurately or comprehensively all of the formal educational activities of the Federal Government within the vast national domain which stretches across a continent and over island possessions in two oceans.
>
> * * * * * * *
>
> Governmental reports do not reveal all that is done in the field of education by the Federal Government, but it is clear that there is not a single aspect of education that is not a concern of some branch of the Federal Government.[38]

The Advisory Committee on Education, appointed by President Franklin D. Roosevelt, reported in 1938 that—

> In recent years, almost every department of the Federal Government has taken on extensive educational functions. * * *
>
> When the entire long record of Federal activities in connection with education is viewed in perspective, it is evident that throughout the years the Federal Government has been increasingly concerned with the development of adequate educational opportunities. This trend may be expected to continue.[39]

In 1939, the Educational Policies Commission of the National Education Association published a study of Federal activities in education. The document declared that it was not a complete review of the "multitudinous" educational activities of Federal agencies, but that it did cover those of the greatest importance to the conduct of education in the States and local communities. The study drew attention to the fact that—

---

[38] Federal Relations to Education. Report of the (U.S.) National Advisory Commission on Education, Washington, D.C., 1931, pt. I, pp. 5–6.

[39] Report of the Advisory Committee on Education. 75th Congress, first session, House Doc. No. 529. Washington, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1938, pp. 24–25.

> the Federal Government has been the founder of the public school systems in most of the States, and its influence on educational development has been both positive and widespread.[40]

The report prepared in 1948 by the task force on public welfare of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government (the Hoover Commission) declared that—

> It would be improper to conclude that the Federal interest in education stops at cooperation with the States. In fact, by far the greater part of the Federal budgetary items concerning education are in other areas, or through other than State channels. Assuming a rather broad definition of "education," but limiting it to matters involving schools and higher educational institutions and students therein, during each of the last few years the Federal Government has expended several billions of dollars through these channels, with participation by practically every major governmental department and independent agency.[41]

Pointing out that educational activities are a major enterprise of the Federal Government, the report listed 200 separate Federal educational programs and gave a "cursory descriptive statement" regarding each of these activities. This report indicated that approximately $3.7 billion of Federal funds had been obligated for educational programs for the 1948–49 school year.

The report on "Federal Educational Activities and Educational Issues Before Congress" which was prepared in the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress and published in 1952 as House Document No. 423, 82d Congress, gave detailed information on 298 separate educational programs operated by the various departments and independent agencies of the Federal Government. Federal funds specifically obligated for the fiscal year 1950 for 255 of these programs totaled more than $3.6 billion. However, the report warned the reader that—

> although the programs reported herein are "educational" under dictionary definition. there are wide differences of opinion as to whether the expenditures for some of the programs should be charged to educational or to other purposes, since frequently the primary or ultimate objectives are noneducational in nature. For this reason it would be impossible from data presently available, to arrive at a generally acceptable estimate of the total expenditures for Federal educational activities.[42]

The report of a special subcommittee of the House Committee on Education and Labor, made public in 1955, listed 315 Federal activities in education, costing $2,173,847,878. The report stated that while the total Federal expenditure for such activities decreased between 1950 and 1955, the decrease had been mainly that for veterans' education—the expenditure by the remaining Federal agencies having more than doubled within the same period.

A 1959 bulletin of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare entitled "Federal Funds for Education" gave brief descriptions of

---

[40] Federal Activities in Education. Washington, D.C., National Association, 1939, p. 2.

[41] The Brookings Institution. Functions and Activities of the National Government in the Field of Welfare. Washington, Government Printing Office, 1949, p. 279.

[42] Quattlebaum, Charles A. Federal Educational Activities and Educational Issues before Congress, 82d Congress, second sess., House Doc. No. 423, p. 147.

137 Federal educational programs. In this connection the bulletin said:

> However, reports issued during past years show that there may be a total of 300 programs if all Federal activities in education are counted. This would indicate that approximately a third of the operating programs are reported here.

For the 137 programs reported as operating in the school year 1956–57 the bulletin accounted for Federal funds totaling $1,997,825,000. The bulletin stated that:

> Information is not availalbe to support any conclusions with reference to the proportion that this amount is of the total amount expended by the Federal Government for all educational services during the school year 1956–57.[43]

A survey and handbook entitled "Federal Educational Policies, Programs and Proposals" was prepared in the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress for the Committee on Education and Labor and printed in three volumes (committee prints) in 1960. In summarizing the findings from the survey, which pertained to fiscal year 1959, the report stated:

> Practically all of the departments and other agencies of the Federal Government are carrying out one or more educational programs. Federal educational activities cover all levels of education from elementary schooling to graduate training at the Nation's leading colleges and universities. The instruction includes virtually all subject fields known to man. Federal educational activities directly affect a large percentage of the population and indirectly affect the remainder of the population of the United States and its possessions. Most of the Federal educational programs are concerned, however, with higher or adult education or specialized training. The Federal Government contributes relatively little to the support of elementary and secondary education in the United States.[44]

The report gave a grand total of $3,900,888,568 for actual or estimated obligations reported by Federal agencies for educational activities during the fiscal year 1959. Concerning the significance of this total, however, the report gave the same warning as in the 1950 report above.[45]

In 1963, the Honorable Edith Green, chairman of the Special Subcommittee on Education, of the Committee on Education and Labor, completed a study of education programs in which the Federal Government was then involved. In her letter to the chairman of the committee transmitting the report, Mrs. Green said:

> From this report it may be readily seen that the question is not *whether* there shall be Federal aid to education. This issue was decided over 100 years ago. The questions now to be debated are:
> How well and effectively is this aid being administered?
> Is there overlapping in some areas?
> Is the best possible return being received for the dollars spent?
> Are there urgent needs in other educational areas?
> Is it in the national interest for the Federal Government to help meet them?[46]

---

[43] U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education. Federal Funds for Education, 1956–57 and 1957–58. Bulletin 1959, No. 2. Washington, Government Printing Office, 1959, p. 2.

[44] Quattlebaum, Charles A., Federal Educational Policies, Programs, and Proposals, pt. II, Survey of Federal Educational Activities, Washington, Government Printing Office, June 1960, pp. 361–362.

[45] Ibidem, pp. 370–371.

[46] The Federal Government and Education. Presented by Mrs. Green of Oregon. 88th Cong., first sess., H. Doc. 159. Washington, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1963, p. III.

In its summary, "based on figures, for the most part, for fiscal year 1962," the report showed the following purposes for which the Federal funds were spent:

Direct support of education	$1,159,189,000
Education of Government personnel	296,072,000
Research in colleges and universities	161,808,000
Total	2,230,169,000

The report said further that:

> Of this total figure, approximately half, or $1.1 billion, provided direct support to the educational system of the United States.
>
> * * * * * * *
>
> As shown in tables in this summary, the agency with the largest involvement in education is the Department of Defense, with expenditures totaling $520.6 million. The Department's expenditures were confined to education of its personnel and their dependents ($322.7 million) and to defense-related research in colleges and universities ($197.9 million).
>
> The Department of Defense and the Veterans' Administration, combined, accounted for $667.6 million, or one-third of the total Government expenditures on educational activities.
>
> The only two Federal agencies with a primary concern for education—the Office of Education and the National Science Foundation—provided $593,923,000 in direct support of education, and expended $67,300,000 for research in educational institutions. Thus the total direct support by the two "education" agencies, amounting to $661.2 million, is less than the educational expenditures attributable to military endeavors.
>
> In addition to the direct support for education previously listed, the Government made available $321,071,000 in repayable loans for college dormitory construction, college students, and the purchase of science, mathematics, and language teaching equipment by private secondary schools.[47]

In 1966 the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare published a "Digest of Educational Statistics," including 7 pages of statistics on "Federal Programs of Education." The introductory statement pointed out that:

> * * * These programs serve a number of purposes. They may be for the purchase of research and training services of educational institutions in the interest of national welfare and defense, for support of individuals for whom there is a special Federal responsibility, for support of schools in areas where Federal activities would result in undue burdens on school services without such support, for support of education in special areas such as vocational education, or for other purposes. Regardless of the specific purpose involved, these programs affect the financing of educational programs and services and the development of the manpower resources of the Nation.[48]

The report asserted that "There is no single total for Federal funds for education that is meaningful for all purposes, but there are many totals to be built around particular concepts and to serve particular needs." Such totals given in the report for the fiscal years 1965 and 1966 included the following:

> Federal funds for education and related activities, estimated obligations for fiscal year 1966—$6,074,317,000.

---

[47] Ibidem, p. 115.

[48] U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Digest of Educational Statistics, 1966. OE–10024–66. Washington, U.S. Government Printing Office 1966, p. 93.

Federal expenditures for research, development and R. and D. plant, estimate for fiscal year 1966—$15,437,700,000.

Federal obligations under financial assistance programs administered by the Office of Education, fiscal year 1965—$1,615,659,000.

Federal grants and loans administered by the Office of Education, by program and by State, fiscal year 1965—$954,717,000.[49]

The survey which will be included in the present study of "Federal Educational Policies and Programs" will show the nature and diversity of Federal educational and training activities, and the diffusion of these activities throughout the Government in the fiscal year 1967. This survey will reflect some of the principal effects of the far-reaching enactments by the Congress in this field since the last similar survey was made for the fiscal year 1959.

---

[49] Ibidem, pp. 94–98.

CHAPTER 2. EVOLUTION OF FEDERAL POLICIES IN EDUCATION, 1777–1960[1]

This historical sketch traces the evolution of the more significant types of Federal policies and programs relating to education during the period 1777–1960. A later chapter will review in somewhat greater detail the major policymaking legislation enacted during the period 1961–1967. A short statement of the historical background of each individual program operating in 1967 will be found in part II of this report.

A. INTRODUCTION AND CHRONOLOGICAL SUMMARY

1. Constitutional Background

Historically and under the Constitution public education in the United States has developed as a responsibility mainly of the States and local governments. However, in its infancy the Federal Government undertook two types of educational activities: (1) operating educational programs of its own, and (2) aiding the States and territories in financing and otherwise promoting education. Both of these types of activity antedate the Constitution, and almost from the time of their inception have included all levels of education.

The Federal Government's own educational pursuits can be traced back to instruction of men in the military service, including schooling in mathematics, as early as in 1777.[2] Action by the Federal Government in support of education in the territories and later in the States began as early as 1785. However, throughout the colonial period in America and for some time after the adoption of the Federal Constitution education was almost universally regarded as chiefly a parental and church responsibility E. P. Cubberley and other historians of American education have drawn attention to the fact that at the time of the framing of the Constitution a nationwide system of public education was only a distant hope of a few statesmen and reformers. At that time a proposal for Federal or State administration of public education would have immediately led to the question:

---

[1] Principal sources: (1) a chapter entitled "Federal Policies and Practices in Higher Education," by Charles A. Quattlebaum, in a volume on "The Federal Government and Higher Education," published by the American Assembly, 1960; (2) an article concerning "Federal Relations to Education," by John K. Norton, in the "Encyclopedia of Educational Research," published by the American Educational Research Association, 1960; and (3) a report entitled "Federal Educational Policies, Programs and Proposals," in 3 vols., by Charles A. Quattlebaum, printed for the use of the House Committee on Education and Labor, 1960. Permission granted by the American Assembly, Prentice Hall, Inc., and the American Educational Research Association, for the use of their copyright publications is gratefully acknowledged. Some of the additional sources used in the preparation of this chapter are identified in the main text and in footnotes.

[2] Holden, E. S., "Origins of the U.S. Military Academy, 1777–1802," in H. Doc. No. 789, 58th Cong., second sess., 1904.

Which church shall control it?[3] Since in America there was no established national church such a proposal would have raised an unresolvable issue.

Furthermore, several historians have pointed out that some of the men who framed the Constitution were the products of the old aristocratic doctrine of education, considering it to be mainly for the leaders and people who could afford it.[4] Being absorbed with their great task of establishing a stable government for the new States, the framers of the Constitution did not debate the issue of the general administration of public education.

Inasmuch as the 10th amendment to the Constitution provided that powers not delegated to the Federal Government were reserved to the States, public education, as it slowly developed during the 19th century, came generally under their jurisdiction. Thus, education in the United States, instead of becoming organized in a single system, as in some other countries, has been organized in many systems. The concept of primary State responsibility for education has accompanied the growth of publicly controlled, nonsectarian education.

At the same time certain provisions of the Federal Constitution have furnished support for a variety of Federal educational programs. Washington declared in his first annual address to Congress:

> * * * there is nothing more deserving your patronage than the promotion of science and literature. * * *
>
> Whether this desirable object will be best promoted by affording aids to seminaries of learning already established, by the institution of a national university, or by any other expedients will be well worthy of a place in the deliberations of the Legislature.

Hamilton observed that whatever concerned the general interests of learning was within the Federal jurisdiction "as far as regards an application of money."[5]

Jefferson, a strict constructionist, in 1806 proposed use of the tariff on imports for "public improvement," including the support of education.[6] In this connection he said, however, that he supposed an amendment to the Constitution would be necessary.

In the course of time, usage and decisions of the Supreme Court[7] have supported the power of Congress to appropriate Federal funds for activities in education shown to be for the purpose of promoting the general welfare.

Among constitutional provisions which have afforded bases for Federal educational programs, besides the general welfare clause, are those giving the Federal Government various powers in connection with the national defense, the power to exercise exclusive jurisdiction over the seat of government of the United States and over certain other areas, and the implied power to govern territories and possessions of the United States. In 1931 the National Advisory Committee on Education, appointed by President Herbert Hoover, reported finding in the Constitution a number of warrants for Federal activities in education.[8]

---

[3] Messenger, J. L., "An Interpretative History of Education," 1931, p. 279.

[4] Cubberley, E. P., "Public Education in the United States," 1934, pp. 85–86. Knight, E. W., "Education in the United States," 1941, pp. 143–144.

[5] "Report on Manufactures," 1791. Comment in: Russell, James E., editor, "National Policies for Education, Health, and Social Services." 1955, p. 5.

[6] Richardson, James D., "A compilation of the Messages and Papers of the Presidents." Vol. 11, p. 397.

[7] *Hamilton* v. *Regents* (1934), 297 U.S. 245; *Wickard* v. *Filburn* (1942), 317 U.S. 111; *Oklahoma* v. *U.S. Civil Service Commission* (1947), 330 U.S. 127, et al.

However, none of these provisions of the Constitution authorizes the Federal Government to exercise any control over State and local school systems. In the laws creating at least 10 of the younger States the Congress specifically gave them the exclusive control over their public schools and colleges. In other acts the Congress has prohibited Federal control over education in the States. In the National Defense Education Act of 1958 the Congress reaffirmed this principle and declared that the States and local communities have and must retain control over, as well as primary responsibility for, public education. The reaffirmation by the Congress of this principle established by the Constitution and subsequent law is significant in relation to recent action by the Federal courts governing certain aspects of the administration of public education by the States and local governments.

2. BEGINNING AND GROWTH OF FEDERAL CONCERN

The chronology below, not intended to be all inclusive, gives the dates of origin of major Federal educational policies and programs. Temporary or discontinued policies and activities are marked with asterisks. This chronology in a sense summarizes the rest of this chapter.

1777—Initiation of direct Federal administration of educational programs, with instruction of military personnel, including schooling in mathematics.
1785—Commencement of aid to territories and later to States for education, by endowment of schools with public lands.
1787—Commencement of endowment of public institutions of higher education with public lands.
1800—First congressional appropriation for books, which became the nucleus of the Library of Congress.
1802—Establishment of the first Federal institution of higher education—the Military Academy at West Point.
1804—Start of Federal provisions for education in the District of Columbia.
1824—Establishment of the first Army special service school—the start of a large system now providing education up to college graduate level.
1845—Establishment of the Naval Academy at Annapolis—the second Federal institution of higher education.
1862—The first Morrill Act—initiation of the Federal policy of aid to States for agricultural and industrial education, through land grants for colleges.
1867—Creation by Congress of a Federal Department of Education—now the Office of Education, serving education at all levels.
1879—Establishment of a Federal school for engravers—probably the beginning of formal inservice training for Federal civilian personnel, now including formal education at many institutions.
1890—The Second Morrill Act—introduction of a policy of Federal money grants for college instruction in specified subjects.
1893—Establishment of the Army Medical School.
1901—Establishment of the Army War College.
1911—Beginning of Federal aid to States for nautical schools, now degree-granting institutions—introduction of the principle of Federal-State matching of funds for education.
1915—Establishment of the Coast Guard Academy, as such—now a degree-granting institution.

---

[8] National Advisory Committee on Education. "Federal Relations to Education," 1931, pt. II, pp. 4–9.

1916—Initiation of the Army Reserve Officers' Training Corps program at colleges and universities.

1917—The Smith-Hughes Act—beginning of Federal policy of promoting vocational education below college grade.

1918—Initiation of rehabilitation training for disabled veterans.

1919—Origin of policy of Federal surplus property disposal to educational institutions.

1920—Organization of the Graduate School of the Department of Agriculture.

1920—The Smith-Bankhead Act—initiation of the policy of Federal-State cooperation in vocational rehabilitation, including education, for persons disabled in industry.

1926—Establishment of the Contract Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps, similar to the Army ROTC.

1933—Establishment of the Federal Emergency Relief Administration, which supported various educational programs.*

1935—Establishment of the National Youth Administration, which gave part-time employment aid to college students.*

1936—Convention for the Promotion of Inter-American Cultural Relations—U.S. entrance into broad-scale international educational exchanges.

1937—National Cancer Institute Act—beginning of policy of granting public health service fellowships.

1937—Creation of the Civilian Conservation Corps, which provided vocational education.*

1939—The Civilian Pilot Training Act—provision for Federal cooperation with colleges in civilian pilot training.*

1942—Establishment of the Armed Forces Institute—offering high school and college correspondence courses.

1943—(Approximate.) Establishment of the Army specialized training program at colleges and universities.*

1944—Servicemen's Readjustment Act—providing unprecedented educational opportunities for veterans.

1944—Surplus Property Act—beginning of development of a broad policy governing surplus property disposal for educational, health, and civil defense purposes.

1946—The George-Barden Act—strengthening Federal-State cooperation in vocational education.

1946—Establishment of the "Regular" Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps—considered by some persons to be a full Federal scholarship program.

1946—Atomic Energy Act—initiation of fellowship offerings by the Atomic Energy Commission.

1946—Passage of the Fulbright Act providing that some of the currencies and credits of other countries acquired by the United States through sale of surplus property abroad might be used for international educational exchanges.

1946—Passage by Congress of a joint resolution approving U.S. membership in the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO).

1948—Smith-Mundt Act—establishing a broad program of international educational exchanges.

1950—Enactment of Public Laws 815 and 874, providing Federal support for schools in certain federally affected localities.

1950—Housing Act—origin of college housing loans program.

1952—Inauguration of the fellowship program of the National Science Foundation.

1954—Establishment of the Air Force Academy.

1956—Organization of the Air Force Institute of Technology as a degree-granting institution.

1958—Educational and cultural exchange agreement between the United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

1958—The National Defense Education Act—establishing new Federal policies in education at all levels.

A full history of Federal educational policies and programs would be voluminous. In the following pages a short account will be offered under selected headings. Organization of this history under these headings may be helpful toward a general understanding of the programs, but the headings are not mutually exclusive. Some of the programs do not fall solely under any one of these headings and will be mentioned wherever seems most appropriate.

This short account cannot include even a brief history of every one of the hundreds of Federal educational activities, but only some of those most indicative of the development of Federal policies in this field.

B. FEDERAL SUPPORT TO EDUCATION IN THE STATES

From the time of its inception the Federal Government has provided lands, funds, and other resources to aid the States and territories in establishing, conducting, and financing education. This policy began with Federal land grants for common schools and colleges in States formed from the public domain. Through the years Federal aid to States, localities, and non-Federal agencies and institutions for education has taken many forms.

1. Early Federal Land and Monetary Grants Policy

An ordinance adopted in 1785 by the Congress of the Confederation for the disposal of public lands in the Western Territory set aside one section in every township for the endowment of schools within that township.

In the ordinance of 1787 the Congress of the Confederation made the now famous declaration of policy that——

> Religion, morality, and knowledge, being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools, and the means of education shall forever be encouraged.

With the admission of Ohio to the Union in 1802, the Congress of the United States began setting aside Federal lands for school support at the time of admission of a State. As other States formed from the public domain were admitted, Congress continued the grants of sections of land for the support of schools.

Under a provision of the ordinance of 1787, Ohio also received two townships of Federal land for the endowment of a university (which became the State university at Athens, known as the Ohio University). Other new States also received Federal lands for the endowment of universities.

Furthermore, when Ohio was admitted, Congress granted to it 5 percent of the money received from the sales of Federal lands in the State. Subsequently 29 other States received such grants varying from 5 to 15 percent. Sixteen States were required by Congress to use this money for the support of education. In 1889, Congress required that all such money thereafter be spent for schools.

Congress also made money grants to some States in lieu of land grants.

Except for a few grants to specific institutions, the early land and monetary grants were without specification of the kind of education to receive support. The Congress pursued a policy of giving financial support to education without attempting to influence the curriculum.

Fletcher Harper Swift has pointed out that the early Federal land and monetary grants were the first stable support for free public education in more than half of the States.[9] The grants strengthened public as related to private education and set a precedent, from a historical viewpoint, for other forms of Federal aid to the States for education.

2. NAUTICAL EDUCATION

State marine school training has a long history dating back to the opening of a school for this purpose in New York in 1874. State marine schools were later organized in Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, California, and Maine.

An act of March 4, 1911, established Federal supervision of and assistance to such schools, including aid for cadet expense and subsistence allowances.

The Pennsylvania State school was closed after World War II. An act of August 18, 1958, amended the act of 1911 respecting aid to the remaining schools. The later act provided, among other changes, Federal grants of $75,000 per year per school agreeing to admit out-of-State students.

3. THE LAND-GRANT COLLEGES

With the passage of the Morrill Act of 1862, Congress initiated a policy of giving aid to the States for education in particular subjects.

The Morrill Act of 1862 provided a grant of Federal lands or land scrip to each State in the amount of 30,000 acres for each Senator and Representative in Congress from that State. The act gave scrip to the States in which there were not sufficient Federal lands to make up their allotments. The proceeds of the sales of these grants were to be used for the endowment and support of colleges having as their primary object "to teach such branches of learning as are related to agriculture and the mechanic arts, in such manner as the legislatures of the States may respectively prescribe." The teaching of military science was also required by the act.

Congress later enacted laws providing for continuing annual appropriations to these institutions.

In the second Morrill Act (1890) Congress introduced the policy of Federal money grants for instruction in certain branches of higher education. The act set a pattern for subvention funds not only in education, but also in other fields. The land-grant colleges and universities have sometimes been referred to as "democracy's colleges" because of the impetus they gave to the expansion of public higher education.[10]

The Federal grants for these institutions have markedly influenced the course of higher education in the United States, both by contributing significantly to its expansion, and by stimulating State support of education in agriculture, engineering, and the natural sciences.

4. EXPERIMENT STATIONS AND EXTENSION SERVICE

With the passage of the Hatch Act of 1887 the Congress began granting funds to each land-grant college for the establishment and maintenance of an agricultural experiment station. This was the first act granting funds to the States for "practical" research. Continuing annual appropriations for this purpose were increased under authority of the Adams Act of 1906, the Purnell Act of 1925, and the Bankhead-Jones Act of 1935.

---

[9] Swift, Fletcher H., "Federal and State Policies in Public School Finance in the United States," 1931.

[10] Ross, Earle D., "Democracy's College," 1942.

In 1914, through the Smith-Lever Act, the Congress initiated a program of cooperation with the States in extension work in agriculture and home economics, to be carried on in connection with the land-grant colleges. Subsequent acts provided additional funds for this work. Matching of Federal funds with State, college, or local funds was required for participation in the program.

Certain reforestation activities authorized by the Clarke-McNary Act of 1924 and the Norris-Doxey Act of 1937 included extension work involving the land-grant colleges.

In his study of Federal relations to higher education made for the Commission on Financing Higher Education, and published in 1952, Richard G. Axt named certain characteristics of the policy which led to the grants for the land-grant colleges and related services. He pointed out that one of the characteristics was emphasis upon vocational and professional rather than "liberal" education.[11]

5. VOCATIONAL EDUCATION BELOW COLLEGE GRADE

The passage of the Federal Vocational Education Act (the Smith-Hughes Act) of 1917 introduced a new Federal policy in education. Since 1862 the Federal Government had fostered agricultural and industrial education conducted in or through the land-grant colleges. With the Smith-Hughes Act the stimulus to vocational education was extended to instruction below college grade.

The Smith-Hughes Act provided for the appropriation of Federal funds not only for industrial courses in public schools but also for the professional training of teachers of such subjects.

Additional appropriations for vocational education below college grade were authorized by the George-Reed Act of 1929 for 4 years and the George-Ellzey Act of 1934 for 3 years. The George-Dean Act of 1936 authorized additional annual appropriations and extended the scope of the program. This act was replaced by the George-Barden Act of 1946, which added new services in vocational education below college grade.

The George-Barden Act authorized an appropriation of $29 million annually as the Federal share of financing the Federal-State program of vocational education. However, partly because large sums were made available to vocational education through the veterans' educational program initiated in 1946, Congress did not vote the full authorization under the George-Barden Act until 1956.

The 84th Congress enacted two bills which extended the scope of the program to include practical nurse training and training for the fishing industry and authorized appropriations for these purposes.

6. 4–H AND OTHER CLUBS

The 1914 Smith-Lever Act which established the Agricultural Extension Service, made boys' and girls' club work an official part of this Service. From this developed the 4–H Club program as a cooperative educational enterprise of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, the State agricultural colleges, and the county extension services.

---

[11] Axt, Richard G., "The Federal Government and Higher Education," 1952.

The Future Farmers of America, a club for boys studying vocational agriculture, was organized in 1928 under auspices of the Federal Board for Vocational Education. This Federal-State cooperative educational organization was chartered and incorporated by an act of Congress approved August 30, 1950.

In 1945 a national executive board and national executive council were established for the Future Homemakers of America, jointly sponsored by the U.S. Office of Education and the American Home Economics Association.

In 1958 the Congress passed Public Law 85–875 to strengthen the Nation's future scientific accomplishment by encouraging elementary and secondary school students' interest in science. In response to the directive contained in the act, the Office of Education began contracting with State departments of education and nonprofit educational institutions to establish science clubs. Funds specifically for this activity were first made available in 1960, from appropriations for salaries and expenses of the Office of Education.[12]

7. Depression Relief Measures

During the depression of the 1930's several Federal emergency agencies engaged in large-scale educational activities as aspects of relief programs in the States and territories. These activities represented new departures in Federal policy in education. Some of the activities were independently administered by Federal agencies; others involved existing State and local school systems and other educational institutions.

The Civilian Conservation Corps, created by act of Congress in 1937, provided vocational training, as well as employment, to youth in need of remunerative occupations. According to a statement contained in a message from President Roosevelt to the Congress in 1939, the major purpose of the CCC was "to promote the welfare and further the training" of the individuals in the Corps.

An organized program of educational activities was carried on in each camp. A considerable amount of vocational training was provided on the work project and on some of the jobs in running the camps. Vocational education was also provided through instruction in classes during leisure time. Many enrollees attended public schools in nearby communities.

The Federal Emergency Relief Administration, established in 1933, developed extensive education programs in the States. These included various forms of adult education, nursery schools, vocational rehabilitation, part-time employment of college students, and employment of needy unemployed teachers for schools closed or partly closed for lack of funds. Another emergency agency, the Work Projects Administration, supported a large number of educational projects ranging from literacy and naturalization classes to academic education at the college level.

---

[12] Eleven States have since inaugurated science club programs. Each State received $5,000 the first year, $2,500 the second year, and consultation only for the third year. Because of higher priorities given other programs, no Federal funds have been used for science clubs for the past 2 years.

The National Youth Administration was established in 1935 to provide work training for unemployed youth and part-time employment for needy students. President Roosevelt said in 1939 that the major purpose of the NYA was to extend the educational opportunities of the youth of the country and to bring them through the process of training into the possession of skills which would enable them to find employment.

During the depression period the Public Works Administration made numerous grants and loans to States and municipalities for the construction of school and college buildings. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation also made self-liquidation loans to State and municipal authorities and to institutions for educational projects.

Altogether Federal grants-in-aid to education and loans for the construction of educational buildings during this period amounted to many hundreds of millions of dollars in addition to expenditure by the Federal Government for its previously established educational programs.

After the start of World War II the depression undertakings were discontinued.

8. Wartime Activities

During World War I, the Federal Government promoted certain educational activities related to the war. Examples of such activities were: the writing and distribution of bulletins for use in the teaching of civics, health-improvement programs, courses to train skilled workers, and training in "victory" gardening to increase the supply of food.[13]

During World War II, the Federal Government carried out or promoted much larger educational programs designed to prepare the civilian population for effective support of the war effort. Some of the established educational programs were adapted to wartime needs, and new programs were initiated.

By an Executive order of September 17, 1942, the functions, duties, and powers of the agencies administering war training were transferred to the War Manpower Commission. The Bureau of Training of the War Manpower Commission was given responsibility for developing unified programs and policies to meet training needs of wartime employment, and for exercising general supervision over the war training programs. The following Federal programs came under the scope of this authority: (1) The apprentice-training service; (2) the National Youth Administration (which was liquidated as of January 1, 1944); (3) vocational training for war production workers; (4) the food production war training program; (5) the engineering, science, and management war training program; (6) the visual aids service; and (7) the student loan program. All but the first two of these were programs of the Office of Education.

Besides these programs a training-within-industry service was established in the War Manpower Commission.

The Office of Civilian Defense, established in 1940, carried out a number of activities in education for civilian defense, instructing thousands of persons in general and specialized techniques of civilian protection. The Office was abolished in 1945.

---

[13] Todd, Lewis P., "Wartime Relations of the Federal Government and the Public Schools, 1917-18," 1945.

The Office of Defense Transportation, established in 1941, promoted utilization by the transportation industry of the war-training facilities of Federal agencies. It also promoted educational programs within the several branches of the transportation industry.

9. Aid to Federally Affected Localities

Just prior to U.S. entry into World War II, the Lanham Act originated a program of aid to local governments for the construction, maintenance, and operation of community facilities in areas swollen by an influx of military personnel and defense workers. The program got underway in the fall of 1941.

Under this program, areas directly affected by the defense effort were eligible to receive funds for school building facilities, school services, and nursing schools for children of mothers employed in defense occupations.

During most of the period of its operation the program was administered directly by the Federal Works Administrator, but in later years its administration was delegated to the Bureau of Community Facilities of the Federal Works Agency. The Office of Education cooperated in the administration of the program.

Under this program, hundreds of towns and cities which had become centers of war production, and had therefore experienced large increases in population, were given assistance in the construction or improvement of school buildings.

Although the operation of the war public services program generally terminated in mid-1946, Federal aid for the maintenance and operation of public schools in federally impacted areas continued on a limited scale under special appropriations.

During the 79th and 80th Congresses some additional legislation providing Federal aid to schools in federally affected localities was passed. Varying provisions were made for aid by different Federal agencies, and a need for uniformity in the legislation became apparent. In 1950 Congress enacted legislation to establish a general program of aid to schools in such areas.

Title II of Public Law 815, approved in September 1950, authorized Federal aid to school construction over a period of 3 years in areas affected by Federal activities. Public Law 874, also approved in September 1950, made provision for maintenance and operation of public schools in such areas over a period of 3 years. The Office of Education was given the duty of administering these laws at the Federal level.

The acts gave specific recognition to the responsibility of the Federal Government for the impact of Federal activities upon school construction needs and upon local educational agencies in the areas of such activities. In these acts Congress declared it to be a policy of the Federal Government to bear the cost of constructing school facilities and to provide assistance to educational agencies in the affected areas in the manner and to the extent prescribed in the laws.

Several other acts of Congress prior to 1960 modified in detail, but continued in substance, the Federal policy of giving assistance to school districts having enrollments particularly affected by defense installations and other Federal activities.

10. LOANS FOR COLLEGE BUILDINGS

In 1950 Congress acted in response to a nationwide demand for college campus residential facilities. The need for such facilities had been multiplying over a period of years as a result of rapidly increasing enrollments and disappearance of private roominghouses.

The College Housing Act of 1950 provided $300 million for long-term, low-interest loans for private and public colleges and universities. Because of the outbreak of hostilities in Korea, however, the college housing program remained inactive until January 1951.

Higher enrollments in 1953 and 1954 again stimulated Federal concern for college and university service-type housing. Public Law 344, 84th Congress, provided several amendments to the college housing program. Public Law 85–104, 85th Congress, increased total funds from $750 to $925 million.[14] Later legislation further amended the program.

11. SURPLUS PROPERTY FOR EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS

Following World War I Congress recognized the value of making surplus Federal property available to educational institutions. An act of 1919 authorized the Secretary of War to sell surplus machine tools to recognized educational institutions at "15 per centum of their cost to trade." Other laws pertaining to utilization of Federal surplus property were approved in 1927 and 1928.

During World War II the Federal Government accumulated a large quantity of real and personal property which later became surplus. In passing the Surplus Property Act of 1944, Congress pursued the policy of making available some of this property for educational usage. The Surplus Property Board and its successor, the War Assets Administration, with assistance from the U.S. Office of Education, determined distribution of such property to educational institutions on the basis of need. The institutions acquired some of the property through donation and some through purchase with discounts allowed for public benefit.

Upon the outbreak of the Korean conflict, the military departments, with the cooperation of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the State agencies for surplus property, undertook to reclaim for use in the defense effort usable items of previously donated property. About $6 million of machine tools and $2 million of miscellaneous items of personal property were recovered from educational institutions and State agency warehouses for use in the Korean defensive effort.

---

[14] Hutchins, Clayton D. (Director), "Federal Funds for Education, 1956–57 and 1957–58." U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1959.

Subsequent legislation augmented and extended the provisions for donations of Federal surplus, real, and personal property for educational and health purposes. This program of secondary utilization of Federal property by tax-supported or tax-exempt health and educational institutions became one of the important Federal-aid programs.

12. NATIONAL SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM

In 1933 the Federal Government began making loans to communities to pay labor costs for preparing and serving lunches in schools. Later surplus foods bought by the Federal Government as an aid to agriculture were distributed to schools for lunches for pupils. In June 1940, a school milk program was introduced in addition to the earlier distribution program. Children could get a half pint of milk for a penny or without charge, the Department of Agriculture and the local organization paying the additional costs. In February 1943, the Department began making cash payments to partly cover the food costs of complete lunches. These payments were made from funds available under section 32 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1934, as amended.

In June 1946 the National School Lunch Act was passed. This act placed the program on a more permanent basis, providing for an annual appropriation specifically for the national school lunch program. This act placed the responsibility for direct administration of the program within the State on the State departments of education, whereas previously the U.S. Department of Agriculture had in most instances carried this responsibility. However, the Department of Agriculture retained responsibility for administering the program directly for private and parochial schools in those States where State agencies are not permitted by State laws to disburse funds to nonpublic schools. The Department was made responsible for overall administration, including the approval or disapproval of States for participation, based on the State's annual plan of operation, and the apportionment of funds (on the basis of a prescribed formula) and food to the States.

13. AERONAUTICAL EDUCATION (CIVIL AERONAUTICS)

Pursuant to the Civilian Pilot Training Act of 1939, the Civil Aeronautics Administration organized a program of civilian pilot training in cooperation with colleges and universities throughout the country. The Civil Aeronautics Authority subsidized these institutions on a per capita basis for courses in ground school subjects and for flight training. This program was discontinued in 1944.

By authority contained in the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 and the Civil Pilot Training Act of 1939 the Civil Aeronautics Administration undertook in February 1942 a program of fostering and encouraging introduction of aviation education into public school curriculums. The program had as its objective the integration of relevant aviation materials into the regular subjects at various grade levels of the elementary and secondary schools, and the introduction of courses in the science of aeronautics for the junior and senior high school youth. This program was phased out after the Civil Aeronautics Administration became the Federal Aviation Agency in 1959.

14. THE NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT OF 1958

In 1958 the Congress passed the National Defense Education Act, containing a statement of findings and purpose reading in part as follows:

> It is * * * the purpose of this act to provide substantial assistance in various forms to individuals, and to States and their subdivisions, in order to insure trained manpower of sufficient quality and quantity to meet the national defense needs of the United States.

Each of the 10 titles of the National Defense Education Act established a new Federal policy in the financial support of education. Examples are: (1) Federal contribution of (generally) 90 percent of the capital loan funds at institutions of higher education for low-interest loans to students for the pursuit of education at these institutions; and (2) Federal grants to State educational agencies for strengthening science, mathematics, and modern foreign language instruction in public elementary and secondary schools and junior colleges.

15. OTHER AIDS TO EDUCATION IN THE STATES

Among other Federal-aid-to-education programs having considerable historical backgrounds are promotion of education for citizenship and extension of library services.

In 1918 the Federal Immigration and Naturalization Service inaugurated a program of promoting education for citizenship. An act of Congress in that year authorized the Service to cooperate with the public schools by sending them identifying information about applicants for naturalization and by preparing citizenship textbooks and supplying them free to the schools.

The Nationality Act of 1940 continued the provisions for this program and broadened the powers of the Service. It authorized the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization—

> to prescribe the scope and nature of the examination of petitioners for naturalization as to their admissibility to citizenship for the purpose of making appropriate recommendations to the naturalization courts.

The act provided for the use of naturalization fees to defray the expenses of the Service in preparing textbooks and otherwise promoting education for citizenship.

The program was authorized to be carried on by the Immigration and Naturalization Service, without authority as a teaching organization, but with responsibility for rendering Federal cooperation with the public schools in education for citizenship.

By enactment of Public Law 597, known as the Library Services Act, in 1956, the 84th Congress inaugurated a policy of providing grants to the States for the extension and improvement of public library services in rural areas. For this purposes the Congress authorized an appropriation of $7,500,000 annually for 5 years. The Congress afterwards made appropriations for the purposes of this act.

In Public Law 813, the 84th Congress authorized appropriations for encouragement and assistance to the States in the establishment of State committees on education beyond the high school and for other purposes. This was in connection with the work of the President's Committee on Education Beyond the High School, in 1956 and 1957.

Public Law 813 was the first act of its kind. It set a precedent for Federal aid to States for the conduct of conferences on educational problems of national concern.

C. FEDERALLY OPERATED EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS

Educational programs operated by the Federal Government have included formal training activities of the Armed Forces, education in special Federal jurisdictions, merchant marine training, and inservice training of Federal employees.

1. Programs of the Armed Forces

Through the years the Federal Government has developed a policy of large-scale provision for the training of the Armed Forces. Implementation of this policy has involved Federal establishment and direct operation of many specialized training schools and a number of institutions of higher education, and also contractual and other utilization of State and privately controlled educational institutions.

Army.—The need for broad education of officers, especially engineers, led to the establishment of the Military Academy at West Point in 1802.

In 1824 the first Army special service school was established. This was the beginning of a large system now providing education, up to college graduate level, in numerous subjects.

The Morrill Act of 1862, creating the land-grant colleges, and an act of 1888, permitting the detail of officers to establish military institutes, founded the system of military education within civil institutes.

World War I led to the establishment of the Students Army Training Corps at institutions of higher education. It was disbanded in December 1918. The National Defense Act of 1916, as amended in 1920, formed the Reserve Officers' Training Corps at 4-year colleges and universities to "qualify students for positions of leadership in times of national emergency." The ROTC program put into effect a new policy in Federal educational activities, involving close working relationships with civil educational institutions.

The entrance of the United States into World War II brought about a number of changes in the whole Army education and training system. Establishment of the Armed Forces Institute in 1942 made high school and college courses available to all military personnel. By 1943 the Army specialized training program, called "the largest university on the face of the earth," was established on more than 300 campuses extending from coast to coast of the United States. This program ended in 1946, a year that marked other developments in Army education, such as establishment of the Army Information, Strategic Intelligence, and Army Security Agency Schools, the Industrial College of the Armed Forces and the National War College—all institutions of higher education.

In 1948 the Congress further amended the National Defense Act of 1916 to enable the Army to undertake a more extensive utilization of civilian colleges and universities for advanced academic training of selected personnel.

Later developments included the initiation of military training and technical assistance to foreign nationals.

Navy.—The Naval Academy at Annapolis was established in 1845. In the 1880's the Navy initiated shore-based schools for specialists.

During World War II, Dean Joseph W. Barker, special assistant to the Secretary of the Navy, said that the Navy itself had become one huge school.

The Naval Academy Preparatory School and the Marine Corps Institute were established in 1920, and the Naval Reserve Officers Training Corps in 4-year colleges and universities in 1926.

After congressional approval of the "Holloway plan" in 1946, Naval Reserve officer training was expanded to include the "regular" NROTC, the "contract" NROTC and the naval aviation college program, all enrolling college students. The "regular" NROTC came to be regarded by some persons as a full, federally financed undergraduate scholarship program.

The Navy's "new five-term college training program," initiated in 1956, provided for education up to baccalaureate level at civilian colleges and universities for certain officers. Similarly the Navy's enlisted scientific education program provided for a 4-year college education, at civilian institutions, for selected enlisted personnel.

As a component of the Navy, the Marine Corps began early to carry out some of its educational programs and share in others.

Air Force.—Under an act of April 3, 1939, the Army Air Forces received authority to institute their own educational system, and began development of a large training program. This was greatly expanded during World War II. The Army Air Forces leased nearly 500 hotels, theaters, and other structures for housing and training facilities, created an officers' training school, and entered into contract with hundreds of civilian schools, colleges, and universities for training specialists.

By provision of the National Security Act of 1947, the Army Air Forces became the autonomous U.S. Air Force.

The Air Force developed the unique policy, among the military services, of training through a university system (the Air University) as well as through a service academy (the Air Force Academy) and an Air Training Command and other administrative organizations.

The Air University grew to include the Air War College, the Air Command and Staff College, the School of Aviation Medicine, the Air Force Institute of Technology, and the Air Force Reserve Officers' Training Corps. The Air Force ROTC was organized in 1946.

An act of April 1, 1954, established the Air Force Academy, which graduated its first class on June 3, 1959.

In 1956 the Air Force Institute of Technology was organized as a degree-granting institution.

Later technological developments introduced new concepts into the educational programs of the Air Force.

Coast Guard.—An act of 1876 provided for the training of officers for the Coast Guard, then known as the U.S. Revenue Cutter Service. A permanent shore academy established at New London, Conn., in 1910 became the U.S. Coast Guard Academy 5 years later. The Academy was organized to train men to become Regular officers in the Coast Guard, with the degree of bachelor of science in engineering.

In 1928 the Coast Guard began to furnish correspondence courses to coastguardsmen on duty at sea and ashore.

2. Implication of Armed Forces Wartime Programs

The historical significance of the armed services educational programs during World War II merits comment here. A few of the important implications can be mentioned in this brief account.

These programs developed certain methods and materials utilized in postwar education. The wartime programs of the Armed Forces applied principles of civilian education and employed many civilian teachers and administrators. They made wider use of visual aids than had civilian schools.[15] Being of technical nature, they generated ideas and techniques for vocational education in civilian schools and in industry.[16]

Tests of aptitudes and skills were developed by the Armed Forces during the war, as also were the uses of audiovisual aids to learning.[17]

The Armed Forces programs during the war included provisions for the training of about 300,000 women in uniform. This training led to improvement in methods of education of women in peacetime.[18]

The wartime armed services programs demonstrated the readiness of mature persons for more education and provided experience in the education of adults.

During the war about 300,000 illiterate trainees were organized in special units in the Army and brought up to the level of fourth grade literacy. This education was very costly as compared with public school education but was given in a relatively short time, about 60 to 90 days.

3. Education in Special Federal Jurisdictions

In its infancy the Federal Government assumed responsibility for the education of persons residing in areas under its special jurisdiction. Formerly, the largest of these were the territories.

Areas of special Federal jurisdiction grew to include the District of Columbia, military posts, Indian reservations and national parks, and outlying possessions. The Federal Government assumed exclusive jurisdiction over some such areas and concurrent jurisdiction over others.

An act of Congress in 1804 and subsequent acts delegated the administration of education in the District of Columbia to established authorities. More recent legislation, including the Organic Act of 1906 for the school system, made clear the continuing policy of the Congress to maintain in the District a system of public education at the elementary, secondary, and higher levels.

The Bureau of Indian Affairs was established in the War Department in 1824 and transferred to the Department of the Interior in 1849. The Bureau made provisions for the education of Indian children through Federal day schools and boarding schools, on the reservations as well as by Federal payments for tuition at nearby public schools.

---

[15] Chambers, M. M., "Opinions on Gains for American Education From Wartime Armed Services Training," American Council on Education, 1946, p. 15.

[16] Grace, A. G. (director), "Educational Lessons From Wartime Training," American Council on Education, 1948.

[17] U.S. Office of Education Bulletin, 1945, No. 9.

[18] Schaffter, Dorothy, "What Comes of Training Women for War," American Council on Education, 1948.

As a responsibility incidental to the building of the Panama Canal, in 1905 the Isthmian Canal Commission began establishment of a public school system in the Canal Zone. The Federal Government later enlarged its provisions for public education in the Canal Zone.

Provisions made from time to time by the Federal Government for education in other areas of special Federal jurisdiction, including outlying posessions of the United States, have been too varied for review in this brief account. Generally, public school systems subject to the approval of the Congress and the President were developed in these areas by their respective governments.

In 1821 the War Department (now the Department of the Army) obtained congressional approval of a code for the establishment and support of schools for the children of Federal employees on military posts. This was the beginning of long-lived arrangements by the Department of the Army and some other Federal departments and independent agencies for schools for dependents of their employees residing on Federal properties. In 1950, the 81st Congress made broad provisions for the education of such dependents and other children living in certain federally affected areas in the United States and most of its possessions.

Provision of elementary and secondary education for dependents of military and civilian personnel in other oversea areas grew to constitute a major activity of the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force.

4. Merchant Marine Training

The Merchant Marine Act of 1936 established the U.S. Maritime Commission and instructed it to develop and maintain an efficient citizen personnel for the merchant marine. In 1938 the Commission established the U.S. Merchant Marine Cadet Corps, which in 1941 began operating the Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point, Long Island. This became a permanent institution bearing a relationship to the merchant marine similar to that which West Point bears to the Army, and Annapolis to the Navy. There is the distinction, however, that graduates of the Merchant Marine Academy become employees of steamship companies rather than of the U.S. Government. Besides these institutions the Maritime Commission through the years established training stations, correspondence schools, upgrade schools, and schools for specialists.

5. Inservice Training of Government Employees

In 1879 the Bureau of Engraving and Printing began inservice training in the form of an apprentice school for engravers. Technical training for employees was instituted by the National Bureau of Standards in 1909. This led to the organization of the National Bureau of Standards Graduate School. In 1920 the Department of Agriculture made arrangements for the organization of its graduate school.

Soon after its creation by act of Congress in 1933, the Tennessee Valley Authority developed a broad inservice training program for its employees.

In a study published in 1951, James Earl Russell found that in 1947 the Federal Government provided "higher" education for about 85,000 persons in schools and colleges which it was operating for that purpose. He observed that most of the instruction was aimed at improving the quality of the Federal service by increasing the competence of Federal employees.[19]

A formal policy statement issued by direction of the President on January 11, 1955, placed the responsibility for employee training and development on the heads of the respective departments and agencies.

An act of Congress approved July 7, 1958, declared it to be a policy of the Congress for self-education by Federal employees to be supported and extended by Government-sponsored programs. This act was supplemented by an Executive order of January 15, 1959, and by regulations issued by the Civil Service Commission on March 25, 1959.

Systems of inservice training in the several departments and agencies of the Government gradually grew to comprise numerous types of courses and instruction.

D. FEDERAL EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS FOR SPECIAL GROUPS

Some of the principal educational programs of the Federal Government were organized for special groups of citizens. These included veterans, physically disabled nonveterans, nurses, certain public health personnel, scientists, and apprentices.

Programs of special purpose education for such groups were organized for administration by Federal agencies through arrangements with non-Federal agencies and institutions in the States, with the Federal agencies wholly or partly financing the programs.

1. Education for Veterans

The Federal policy of providing vocational rehabilitation training for veterans originated during World War I.

The Vocational Rehabilitation Act of June 27, 1918, provided substantially that any honorably discharged veteran of World War I who was able to carry on in a gainful occupation successfully, should be furnished, when vocational rehabilitation was feasible, such course of rehabilitation as the Federal Board for Vocational Education should provide. The act imposed upon the Board the responsibility to provide facilities, courses, and instructors necessary to insure proper training; to prescribe the courses to be followed; to pay allowances for maintenance and support of trainees and other necessary expenses incidental to following the prescribed courses; and to do all other things necessary to insure vocational rehabilitation and placement of rehabilitated persons in gainful occupations.

Section 3 of the act provided for training for those honorably discharged veterans who suffered a compensable disability as a result of their war service, but who were not vocationally handicapped to the extent that rehabilitation training was required. Persons in this class were given courses of instruction, including tuition and necessary supplies, but not with the maintenance and support allowance while in training.

---

[19] Russell, James E., "Federal Activities in Higher Education After the Second World War," 1951, p. 13.

On August 9, 1921, Congress established an independent bureau under the President which was called the U.S. Veterans' Bureau. All of the duties, functions, and powers previously conferred upon the Federal Board for Vocational Education, in providing courses for vocational rehabilitation for disabled veterans of World War I, were transferred to the Veterans' Bureau.

The program authorized by the Vocational Rehabilitation Act of 1918 terminated on June 30, 1928. However, Public Law 16, the Vocational Rehabilitation Act of 1943, was quite similar to the act which was passed for World War I veterans, except that there was no provision in the latter law similar to section 3 for the disabled veterans of World War II. The education and training provisions of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 (Public Law 346, 78th Cong.) took the place of section 3.

Following the passage of Public Law 16, the Veterans' Administration began to emphasize the necessity of vocational advisory service to the disabled veteran. Regional offices of the Veterans' Administration were used to give vocational counseling, and educational institutions contracted with the Veterans' Administration to render this service. In addition, the Veterans' Administration adopted the policy that, if possible, the disabled veteran would be trained in the community where he was living, and also that it would use only existing accredited institutions of learning and first-class establishments for training on the job.

The Veterans' Administration, unlike the Federal Board for Vocational Education, did not establish schools of its own, although it had the authority to do so.

The Servicemen's Readjustment Act approved June 22, 1944, authorized an educational program of unprecedented scope for veterans of World War II. Practically all veterans became eligible for educational benefits under this act. Each eligible veteran was free to elect his own course; he was free to enter any school or training establishment which had been approved by the appropriate approving agency of the State in which such school or training establishment was located. He could pursue a course of education or training which he had elected for a period of time not in excess of 1 year, plus the number of months he was in the service, but not in excess of 48 months.

Both Public Law 16 and Public Law 346 terminated on July 25, 1956, except for certain cases under Public Law 346, as amended.

On December 28, 1950, Congress extended the provisions of Public Law 16 to veterans who served at any time subsequent to June 27, 1950, and prior to a date to be established by Congress or by the President, and who were disabled under conditions entitling them to the wartime rate of pension. Later acts of Congress extended benefits similar to those of Public Law 16 and Public Law 346 respectively to disabled and nondisabled veterans who served during the period of June 27, 1950, to January 31, 1955 (Korean conflict veterans). However in the enactment of Public Law 550 the Congress modified the policy of providing veterans' educational benefits. Under the simplified system of allowance for subsistence, tuition, et cetera, the individual veteran became responsible for payments to the educational institution of his choice.

2. VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION OF PHYSICALLY DISABLED PERSONS (EXCEPTING VETERANS)

The Smith-Bankhead Act of June 2, 1920, first provided Federal funds for the purpose of cooperating with the States in the vocational rehabilitation of persons disabled in industry or otherwise. A number of subsequent acts, including the Social Security Act as amended in 1939, changed the Federal provisions for this largely educational program.

An act of July 6, 1943, amended and superseded the Vocational Rehabilitation Act of 1920. It provided for vocational rehabilitation of war disabled and other disabled individuals through federally approved State plans. The 1943 amendments included provision for payment to the States of administrative expenses and one-half of expenditures for rehabilitation and necessary expenditures for disabled individuals other than veterans.

An act approved August 3, 1954, provided for more effective use of available Federal funds for the improvement of vocational rehabilitation services, including educational services.

3. TRAINING OF NURSES

An extensive federally supported nurse training program, begun in 1941, was extended by the Bolton Act of 1943. Under the general administration of the U.S. Public Health Service, training for undergraduate and graduate nurses was carried out in regular nurse training institutions. With the aid of congressional appropriations totaling more than $182 million, a total of 1,125 schools participated in the program. Enrollments ended in October 1945.

A 1956 amendment to the George-Barden Vocational Education Act of 1946 authorized $5 million for each year of a 5-year period for matching grants to the States for the extension and improvement of practical nurse training.

The Health Amendments Act of 1956 provided traineeships for advanced training of professional nurses to teach various branches of nursing. Title I emphasized preparation for staff positions in public health nursing. Title II authorized funds for preparation of nurses for administrative, supervisory, and teaching positions in all branches of nursing. The act provided for traineeships to be awarded by the Surgeon General through grants to public or other nonprofit training institutions.

4. TRAINING OF PERSONNEL IN STATE AND LOCAL PUBLIC HEALTH WORK

Title VI of the Social Security Act of 1935 and section 314 of the Public Health Service Act of 1944 authorized expenditure of Federal funds for training personnel in State and local health work. Beginning in 1940, Public Health Service regulations no longer stipulated the amounts allotted exclusively for training purposes, and States became free to decide, subject to Federal approval, the sum to be expended from general health and categorical health program grants.

In 1956, a Public Health Service-sponsored traineeship program was established to increase the number of trained public health personnel. The traineeships were provided for graduate or specialized public health training of professional health personnel with skills required in public health activities. The program provided for the traineeships to be awarded either (1) directly to individuals having applications accepted by approved training institutions, or (2) through grants to such institutions. Due to the increased attendance at public and nonprofit schools of public health resulting from the augmented program, training grants were authorized in 1958 to such schools for participation in their costs.

5. TRAINING OF SCIENTISTS

The National Science Foundation Act of 1950 established the National Science Foundation for a number of purposes. Among these were (1) development and encouragement of a national policy for the promotion of basic research and education in the sciences; and (2) awarding of scholarships and graduate fellowships in the sciences.

The Foundation inaugurated a fellowship program in the 1952–53 academic year. Through grants for the support of basic scientific research the Foundation about that time also began supporting a number of graduate and postdoctoral students performing research services for the grantees, and summer institutes for science and mathematics teachers.

The Atomic Energy Commission was established by the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 as amended by the Atomic Energy Act of 1954. Under provisions of this legislation the Commission established small numbers of fellowships in radiological physics in 1948, in industrial medicine in 1949, and in industrial hygiene in 1952.

Fellowships in fields of public health were initiated with the passage of the National Cancer Institute Act of 1937. As other national institutes of health were activated they established research fellowship and/or traineeship programs.

Related to these programs was the enactment of legislation by the 84th Congress providing graduate traineeships to increase the supply of public health specialists.

In several titles of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 Congress provided a number of aids to the training of scientists.

6. APPRENTICESHIP AND OTHER INDUSTRIAL TRAINING

A policy of Federal promotion of apprentice training was initiated in 1934 under authority of the National Industrial Recovery Act. Funds to continue the work were provided by the National Youth Administration established in 1935.

In 1937 the Secretary of Labor authorized a formal program of apprenticeship. A Federal Committee on Apprenticeship, which had been originally established in 1934, was reorganized and appointed by the Secretary of Labor as the national employer-labor, policy-recommending body to the Bureau of Apprenticeship. In 1938 the Secretary of Labor appointed a General Committee on Apprenticeship for the Construction Industry to cooperate with the Bureau in promoting the establishment of national and local joint contractor-labor apprenticeship committees in each of the building trades and in setting up apprenticeship programs.

In December 1956, the Secretary of Labor transferred the functions of the Bureau of Apprenticeship to the Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training. The words "and Training" emphasize the broad role the Bureau was to perform in stimulating training of workers in industry, including journeyman training, supervisory training, and training in skilled occupations not considered as apprenticeable.

7. EDUCATION OF OTHER SPECIAL GROUPS

The foregoing account has given historical examples of Federal assistance to special groups of citizens to secure certain types of education.

Prior to 1960 the Federal Government also aided other special groups to secure education for particular purposes. Information concerning the history of the programs for these groups, such as Indians living on reservations, is given in part II of this report.

E. FEDERAL ADVISORY, RESEARCH, AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES IN EDUCATION

There is a distinct difference between the administration of "Federal aid" programs, here considered administrative services, and the direct administration of an educational activity, such as operation of the Military Academy by the Department of the Army.

For a number of years prior to 1960 the Federal Government performed a wide variety of statistical, informational, consultative, advisory, research, and administrative services in education. Most of the departments and independent agencies of the Federal Government and special federally sponsored commissions performed some such services. However, the Office of Education bore the major share of this work in the discharge of its staututory functions. Its activities ranged from compilation and publication of statistics on education to the administration of Federal aid to schools in federally affected localities and various programs under the National Defense Education Act.

The subject of advisory, research, and administrative services by all Federal agencies is too broad to be fully covered here. Mentionings of such services by some other Federal agencies appear elsewhere in this report. A later chapter of this report will review the history and present organization and functions of the Office of Education and the National Science Foundation. Another chapter will deal with governmental advisory commissions and their reports concerning education through the years.

F. FEDERAL EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES IN COOPERATION WITH OTHER COUNTRIES

By 1960 the Government of the United States had engaged in several types of activities in the field of international education. These may be listed as follows: (1) The bilateral relation of the U.S. Government with other countries; (2) the international educational relations participated in by the U.S. Government as a member of or contributor to several international organizations, such as the Pan American Union;

and (3) the relations with defeated nations under the program for their reeducation in the ways of democracy following World War II.

The basic policy of the U.S. Government in this field early became that of fostering mutual understanding, appreciation, and respect. Actions by the Congress and by several Presidents contributed to the evolution and implementation of this policy.

Educational and cultural relations with foreign countries became one phase of the foreign policy of the United States. After World War II, the Government of the United States, like the governments of a number of other countries, great and small, placed greater emphasis on activities in this field.

1. Bilateral Programs

A forerunner of broad-scale educational and cultural relations between the United States and other countries was the Convention for the Promotion of Inter-American Cultural Relations, or the Buenos Aires Treaty, of December 23, 1936. In accordance with the terms of this convention, the United States began a continuous exchange of two graduate students with each of the 16 signatory nations of the other Republics.

Bilateral activities of the U.S. Government in educational exchange with other nations were authorized by acts of Congress establishing the functions of the various agencies participating, and by acts specifically providing for certain cooperative relationships. Such activities included the exchange of special information and materials; and the interchange of specialists, professors, and students.

On August 1, 1946, President Harry S. Truman signed the Fulbright Act providing that some of the currencies and credits of other countries acquired by the United States through the sale of surplus property abroad might be used for international educational exchanges. The act established a Board of Foreign Scholarships to select persons to receive awards and supervise the educational activities undertaken in a program administered by the Department of State. The Smith-Mundt Act of January 1948 prescribed in broad terms the specifications for a major program of international information and educational exchanges.

The India Food Aid Act of 1951 authorized educational exchanges between the United States and India, financed from sums payable by the Government of India to the United States as interest on emergency food loans.

On January 27, 1958, the U.S. Department of State announced an exchange agreement between the United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. The agreement included provision for exchange of graduate students, instructors, and professors of the universities of the two countries.

An Executive order of May 9, 1955, established the International Cooperation Administration as a semiautonomous agency in the Department of State, and transferred to this agency functions formerly administered by predecessor agencies. Education became an essential ingredient of the technical assistance programs administered by the ICA. Technical assistance soon provided a variety of training in the United States and abroad for thousands of persons.

On October 22, 1953, the President gave to the newly created U.S. Information Agency a statement of mission, including certain activities of educational nature, such as library services, exhibits, lectures, and guidance to students through binational centers abroad.

2. PARTICIPATION IN PROGRAMS OF INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

Through membership in the International Bureau of American Republics and in the Pan American Union which developed from it, the United States began in 1906 to participate in inter-American educational exchanges.

In November 1945, delegates from the United States and 43 other countries, meeting in London, drafted a permanent constitution for the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization. The constitution came into force when adopted by the governments of over 20 nations within the following year. The charter provided for detailed (1) collaborating in the advancement of mutual understanding of peoples; (2) giving fresh impulse to popular education and to the spread of culture; and (3) maintaining, increasing, and diffusing knowledge. The first UNESCO general conference was held in Paris in November and December 1946.

A joint resolution approving U.S. membership in UNESCO passed both Houses of Congress in 1946 and was approved by President Truman on July 30 of that year. The resolution authorized the establishment of a national commission to serve as a bridge between the UNESCO and the Government and private voluntary groups in the United States.

3. REEDUCATION AND EDUCATIONAL RECONSTRUCTION

Two major problems in international educational relations emerged from World War II, namely: (1) The reconstruction of the educational systems of the war-devastated countries; and (2) the reeducation of the defeated nations in the ways of democracy.

Before the close of World War II, interested agencies of the Governments of the United States and certain allied countries cooperated in formulating policies for the reeducation of the citizens of the Axis nations. The plans called for the suppression of extreme nationalistic teachings and the furtherance of instruction in democratic ideals.

The overall reeducation policy recognized that the reorientation of the Axis nations toward a democratic way of life was primarily an educational task requiring international cooperation.

CHAPTER 3. CONGRESSIONAL ENACTMENTS CONCERNING EDUCATION AND TRAINING, 1961–66

(Note: A digest of "Enactments by the 90th Congress Concerning Education and Training, First Session, 1967," prepared in the Legislative Reference Service by Charles A. Quattlebaum, was made public as a committee print of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, U.S. Senate, in June 1968.)

This chapter summarizes the legislation concerning education and training enacted by the Congress during the period 1961 through 1966. Included are laws concerned solely or mainly with education and training, and educational and training provisions of laws concerned principally with other matters.

This summary includes both legislation involving direct Federal financing and administration of educational and training activities, and legislation involving forms of Federal aid to States, localities, institutions, and individuals in this field.

Laws considered by the writer of this report to represent major developments or innovations in Federal policy are marked with an asterisk. It is recognized that the designation of such laws is a matter of personal judgment, and that agreement of all interested persons upon such designation would probably be impossible to obtain. Nevertheless, the reader, by noting the laws marked with an asterisk in the following pages, may perceive the general development of Federal policies in education from 1961 through 1966. The legislation as a whole is summarized here for the benefit of those who wish to consider it fully.

For the convenience of the busy reader, generally the summary for each session lists first the larger measures of broader interest. However, the order of presentation is not intended to represent a precise evaluation of the relative educational or other importance of these laws. It is recognized that upon such a matter there might be a marked difference of opinion.

A. EIGHTY-SEVENTH CONGRESS

1. First Session, 1961

Not counting appropriation acts, a number of laws wholly or partly concerning education and training were enacted by the 87th Congress during its first session, 1961. Some of the larger measures of more general interest were:

Public Law 87–344. General extension of the 10-title National Defense Education Act through June 30, 1964. (Title IX, which authorized establishment of a Science Information Service, did not need to be extended.) Extension through June 30, 1963, of the sections of Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, which provide for Federal payment of part of the cost of the construction and operation of schools for the benefit of children of parents who either work or reside on

Federal property or are employed in projects representing new or increased Federal activities.*

Public Law 87-256. The Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act, revising and coordinating the programs for educational and cultural exchanges with other countries and for other international educational activities.*

Public Law 87-195. The Foreign Aid Act of 1961, involving education and requiring emphasis on programs of development of education and human resources through such means as technical cooperation in areas which are in the earlier stages of economic development.

Public Law 87-293. Establishment of the Peace Corps to help the people of interested countries meet their needs for trained manpower through arrangements with colleges and universities and other means, and with, as stated by President Kennedy, emphasis on teaching.*

Public Law 87-70. Title IV of the Housing Act of 1961, which increased by $300 million for each year through 1964 the revolving fund authorization for loans to colleges, universities, and hospitals for the construction of housing.

Public Law 87-27. Federal aid to State vocational education agencies and/or Federal provision by contract with educational institutions for occupational training of unemployed or underemployed persons in depressed areas.

Public Law 87-276. Provision for grants-in-aid to institutions for the training of teachers of deaf persons.

Public Law 87-274. Authorization of grants for the training of personnel for employment in programs for juvenile delinquency control.

Public Law 87-163. Authorization to the President to provide for suitable cooperation of Federal agencies with the land-grant colleges and universities in celebration of the centennial of these institutions.

Among other laws concerning education and training enacted during the first session of the 87th Congress were those providing for: Authorization for certain construction, including construction of various training facilities and community facilities such as schools, at numerous military installations; practical nurse training extension; further promotion of education for blind persons; establishment of a teaching hospital for Howard University; and an increase of the authorization for vocational training for Indians.

2. SECOND SESSION, 1962

Laws wholly or partly concerning education and training enacted by the 87th Congress during its second session, 1962, included the following:

Public Law 87-638. This provided for a method of payment of indirect costs of research and development contracted by the Federal Government at universities, colleges, and other educational institutions.*

Public Law 87-786. Amendment of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 so as to permit donations of surplus personal property to schools for the mentally retarded, schools for the physically handicapped, radio and television stations licensed by the Federal Communications Commission as educational radio or educational television stations, and public libraries.*

Public Law 87–835. This act amended the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 to require certain additional information to be filed by an applicant for a scholarship or fellowship. Public Law 87–835 also amended the National Defense Education Act of 1958 with respect to certain requirements for payments or loans under the provisions of that act.

Public Law 87–579. A revision of the laws relating to depository libraries.

Public Law 87–546. Amendment of Chapter 35 of title 28, United States Code, relating to war orphans' educational assistance, in order to permit eligible persons thereunder to attend foreign educational institutions under certain circumstances.

Public Law 87–555. Amendment of title 10, United States Code, to permit members of the Armed Forces to accept fellowships, scholarships, or grants.

Public Law 87–715. Provision for the production and distribution of educational and training films for use by deaf persons.

Public Law 87–536. Amendment of section 6(d) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act to authorize certain persons who complete a Reserve Officer's Training Corps program to be appointed as commissioned officers in the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

Public Law 87–417. Amendment of the act of June 4, 1958 (67 Stat. 41) entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior, or his authorized representative, to convey certain school properties to local districts or public agencies."

Besides appropriation acts, other legislation approved in 1962: Amended the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955; provided for a National Portrait Gallery as a bureau of the Smithsonian Institution; and established in the Library of Congress a library of instructional materials to further educational, vocational and cultural opportunities in the field of music for blind persons.

B. EIGHTY-EIGHTH CONGRESS

1. First Session, 1963

Enactments by the 88th Congress in 1963 concerning education and trianing ranged from grants for construction of teaching facilities for medical, dental, and other health personnel, as provided in Public Law 88–129, which was called in the public press the "first new education measure since 1958," to Public Law 88–210, which contains provisions affecting education at all levels. Enactments include the following:

Public Law 88–129, the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act of 1963, which authorized matching grants for the construction of teaching facilities for the training of persons for specified health professions, and loans to students of medicine, dentistry, and optometry.*

Public Law 88–164, the Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act of 1963, which, among other provisions, authorized grants for the construction of university-affiliated facilities for the mentally retarded. The act also expanded the program for training teachers of handicapped children so as to include all handicapped children.*

Public Law 88–204, the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963, which authorized grants and loans to public and other nonprofit institutions of higher education in financing the construction, rehabilitation, or improvement of needed classrooms, laboratories, libraries, and related facilities in undergraduate and graduate institutions.*

Public Law 88–210, part A, the Vocational Education Act of 1963, which broadened the definition of vocational education; authorized grants to States to assist them to maintain, extend, and improve their programs of vocational education for persons of all ages; and authorized grants for work-study programs and residential vocational education schools.*

Public Law 88–210, part B, the National Defense Education Act amendments, which extended for 1 year and increased the authorization for the student loan program; and extended for 1 year and in some instances amended the programs for national defense fellowships; guidance, counseling, and testing; modern foreign language study; research and experimentation with teaching aids; and improvement of educational statistics.

Public Law 88–210, part C, school assistance to federally affected areas extension, which continued to June 30, 1965, the programs of Federal assistance for public school construction, operation, and maintenance in certain federally affected localities.

Public Law 88–214, the Manpower Development and Training Act amendments which extended and expanded the training programs under this act.

Public Law 88–2, universal military training and service extension to July 1, 1967, generally affecting the education and training of the Nation's young men.

Public Law 88–136, Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare appropriations, fiscal 1964, which included among the larger appropriations affecting education and training, $219,620,000 for grants, loans, and payments under the National Defense Education Act, and $110 million for manpower development and training activities of the Office of Manpower, Automation, and Training, Department of Labor.

Public Law 88–149, Department of Defense Appropriations, fiscal 1964, which appropriated billions of dollars for the Armed Forces, much of that going for the training of personnel, including vocational training in many fields.

Public Law 88–200, Peace Corps Act amendments, authorizing, for fiscal 1964, an appropriation of $102 million for the Peace Corps program, which operates largely through educational institutions.*

Public Law 88–205, Foreign Assistance Act of 1963, containing several provisions affecting education and training activities, widely involved in foreign aid.

Publc Law 88–206, the Clean Air Act, containing a number of provisions for training and research, carried out largely at educational institutions.*

Public Law 88–210, Indian vocational training amendments, increasing the authorization for and otherwise enlarging the adult Indian vocational education program.

Public Law 88–215, independent offices appropriations, fiscal 1964, including the appropriation of $323,200,000 for salaries and expenses of the National Science Foundation, an agency "whose primary concern is education." [1]

Public Law 88–245, Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the judiciary and related agencies appropriations, fiscal 1964, including appropriation of $42,625,000 for the mutual educational and cultural exchange activities, and appropriations for other programs involving education and training.

Public Law 88–246, which provides for the preparation and printing of materials relating to annual national high school and college debate topics.

Public Law 88–126, providing for State approving agency approval of courses under the war orphans' educational assistance program.

2. Second Session, 1964

In 1964 the Congress considered numerous measures concerning education and training. On August 8, 1964, President Lyndon B. Johnson said that the Congress was completing "a record of support for education unmatched in our history." [2] Enactments of 1964 included:

Public Law 88–269, the Library Services and Construction Act, which increased Federal aid for the development of library services, extended such aid to urban as well as rural areas, and provided for Federal assistance for the construction of public library buildings.*

Public Law 88–361, which provides for educational assistance to the children of veterans totally and permanently disabled from service-connected disabilities.

Public Law 88–368, which extended the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act of 1961 for 2 years, and provided for a special study of school attendance and child labor laws, and for a national juvenile delinquency demonstration project.*

Public Law 88–452, the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, which, while not an education bill as such, contains a number of educational and training provisions.*

Public Law 88–497, the Graduate Public Health Training Amendments of 1964, which extended the authorization for assistance in the provision of graduate or specialized public health training.

Public Law 88–579, which provided for a National Council on the Arts.

Public Law 88–581, which amended the Public Health Service Act to increase the opportunities for training professional nursing personnel.

Public Law 88–654, which amended title VII of the Public Health Service Act so as to extend to qualified schools of optometry and students of optometry those provisions thereof relating to student loan programs.

Public Law 88–665, titles I–X, the National Defense Education Act Amendments, 1964, which extended and broadened the provisions of the National Defense Education Act of 1958, as amended.*

---

[1] "The Federal Government and Education" (88th Cong., first sess., H. Doc. 150, p. X).

[2] Washington Star, Aug. 9, 1964, p. A6.

Public Law 88–665, title XI, which extended for 1 year the program of financial assistance to "federally impacted" school districts, and included for the first time schools in the District of Columbia.

Public Law 88–276, which changed provisions for the nomination and selection of candidates for appointment to the Military, Naval, and Air Force Academies.

Public Law 88–352, the Civil Rights Act, which contains several titles affecting education and training.*

Public Law 88–379, which established water resource research centers at land-grant colleges and State universities and otherwise promotes a national program of water research.

Public Law 88–560, the Housing Act of 1964, which includes provision for two new programs for training specialists in city planning and community development.

Public Law 88–605, which made appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare for fiscal 1965, including appropriations for new educational and training programs.

Public Law 88–635, the 1965 Supplemental Appropriation Act, which included appropriation of supplemental funds for certain educational and training purposes.

Public Law 88–633, the Foreign Assistance Act of 1964, which authorized appropriations for a number of activities involving education and training.

Public Law 88–647, which amended and enlarged the Reserve Officers' Training Corps program.

C. EIGHTY-NINTH CONGRESS

1. First Session, 1965

In his annual message to Congress on education on January 12, 1965, President Johnson urged "that we push ahead with the No. 1 business of the American people—the education of our youth in preschools, elementary and secondary schools, and in the colleges and universities."

President Johnson's remarks upon signing the Higher Education Act of 1965 on November 8, 1965, included the following statement:

> This bill is only one of more than two dozen education measures enacted by the first session of the 89th Congress. And history will forever record that this session—the first session of the 89th Congress—did more for the wonderful cause of education in America than all the previous 176 regular sessions of Congress did, put together.
>
> I doubt that any future Congress will ever erect a prouder monument for future generations.[3]

Measures concerning education and training enacted by the Congress in 1965 ranged from increasing appropriations for some relatively minor and long-established activities to initiation of broad new policies and programs in this field. Enactments of 1965 included the following:

Public Law 89–10, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, which authorizes: (1) Federal financial aid to local educational agencies for the education of children of low-income families; (2) Federal funds for use in the acquisition of school library resources and institutional materials; (3) Federal funds for supplementary education centers and services; (4) Federal grants for research, surveys, and demonstrations in education; and (5) Federal grants to strengthen certain activities of State departments of education.*

---

[3] Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents. Vol. I, No. 16, Nov. 15, p. 478.

Public Law 89–329, the Higher Education Act of 1965, which authorizes Federal appropriations for aiding community educational services and continuing education programs, increasing college library resources, promoting library training and research, and supporting cataloging of library materials, strengthening developing colleges, providing financial aid to academically qualified and needy students, establishing a national teacher corps, et cetera.*

Public Law 89–15, the Manpower Act of 1965, providing opportunity for training and jobs to people previously denied jobs for lack of training.*

Public Law 89–73, the Older Americans Act of 1965, which includes authorization for Federal grants for community planning services and training, and grants for development and training projects.*

Public Law 89–105, the Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act Amendments of 1965, which includes authorization of Federal appropriations for training of teachers of handicapped children, and has other educational features.*

Public Law 89–253, the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1965, which has a number of educational and training features, including development of work-training programs, work-study programs, et cetera.*

Public Law 89–287, which established a system of loan insurance and a supplementary system of direct loans to assist students to attend postsecondary business, trade, technical, and other vocational schools.*

Public Law 89–290, which authorizes appropriations to aid schools of medicine, dentistry, osteopathy, optometry, and podiatry in improving the quality of their educational programs; provides for scholarship grants to students in the health professions; and otherwise promotes education in the health professions.*

Public Law 89–69, which extended for 1 year the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act, including its grants for demonstration projects and grants for personnel training.

Public Law 89–115, which extends the health research facilities grants program for 3 years, making available construction assistance for research facilities for new medical and dental schools.*

Public Law 89–117, the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965, which includes extension of the college housing loan program through 1968 at the rate of $300 million a year.*

Public Law 89–182, which provides for Federal grants to support State technical services, designed to enable business, commerce, and industry to acquire and more effectively use scientific information through various means, such as training programs.*

Public Law 89–171, the Foreign Assistance Act of 1965, which contains several provisions affecting education and training, widely involved in foreign aid.

Public Law 89–137, which increased subsistence allowances to disabled veterans pursuing vocational rehabilitation training.

Public Law 89–209, which provided for the establishment of the National Foundation for the Arts and Humanities.*

Public Law 89–291, which authorizes grants to assist in construction and rehabilitating medical library facilities, in training medical librarians, and in otherwise developing medical libraries.*

Public Law 89–313, which provides for Federal aid for school construction in areas affected by disasters.*

Public Law 89–333, which liberalized Federal financing of vocational rehabilitation programs and otherwise amended the Vocational Rehabilitation Act.

Public Law 89–36, which provided for the establishment and operation of a National Technical Institute for the Deaf.

Public Law 89–77, which amended Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, as applied to certain areas outside the continental limits.

Public Law 89–125, which amended the National Arts and Cultural Development Act of 1964.

Public Law 89–138, which amended disabled veterans vocational rehabilitation legislation.

Public Law 89–178, which authorized grants for a program of research and study of personnel needs in the fields of correctional rehabilitation, et cetera.

Public Law 89–222, which increased war orphans' educational assistance.

Public Law 89–239, which amended the Public Health Service Act so as to further assist in combating heart disease, cancer, stroke, and other major diseases through research and training.

Public Law 89–258, which provides for a loan service of captioned films and other educational media for deaf persons.

Public Law 89–51, which made certain technical changes in the law respecting the Reserve Officers Training Corps.

Public Law 89–53, which authorized appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for fiscal 1966, including an authorization of $4,536,971,000 for research and development, usable in part for grants to nonprofit institutions of higher education.

Public Law 89–57, which made appropriations to the Treasury and Post Office Departments, the Executive Office of the President, and certain dependent agencies, for fiscal 1966, including funds for operation of the Coast Guard Academy.

Public Law 89–128, the Independent Offices Appropriations Act for fiscal 1966, containing an appropriation of $479,999,000 for the National Science Foundation, an agency "whose primary concern is education."[4]

Public Law 89–134, which authorized $115 million for the fiscal 1966 Peace Corps program, largely involving teaching and arrangements with educational institutions.

Public Law 89–156, the Department of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriations Act for 1966, including among the larger appropriations affecting education and training $273,500,000 for manpower development and training, $252,491,000 for expansion and improvement of vocational education, and $412,608,000 for defense educational activities.

---

[4] "The Federal Government and Education," 88th Cong., first sess., H. Doc. 150, p. X.

Public Law 89–160, which authorized language training to be given dependents of members of the Armed Forces under certain circumstances.

Public Law 89–164, the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriation Act for fiscal 1966, including an appropriation of $53 million for mutual educational and cultural exchange activities, and appropriations for some other programs involving education and training.

Public Law 89–169, which authorized an agreement with the University of Texas for operation of the Lyndon Baines Johnson Archival Depository.

Public Law 89–199, the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare Supplemental Appropriation Act for 1966, appropriating $967 million for elementary and secondary educational activities, besides supplemental funds for several other programs concerned with education and training.

Public Law 89–213, the Department of Defense Appropriation Act, 1966, appropriating billions of dollars for the Armed Forces, much of it being available for the training of personnel, including vocational training in many fields.

Public Law 89–260, which authorized construction of the third Library of Congress building, to be named the Library of Congress James Madison Memorial Building.

Public Law 89–273, the Foreign Assistance and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 1966, appropriating $202,355,000 for economic assistance, $1,170 million for military assistance, and some other sums for activities involving education and training.

Public Law 89–280, which increased the authorization for appropriations to the Smithsonian Institution, an establishment for the "increase and diffusion of knowledge among men."

Public Law 89–309, the 1966 Supplemental Appropriation Act, including $160 million for higher educational activities, $5,700,000 for the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities, and $8,310,000 for grants to States for vocational rehabilitation, including training.

Public Law 89–316, the 1966 Department of Agriculture and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, including appropriations of $75,600,000 for cooperative agricultural extension work, $157 million for the national school lunch program, and $7 million for facilities of the National Agricultural Library.

2. SECOND SESSION, 1966

Laws wholly or partly concerning education and training enacted by the 89th Congress during its second session, 1966, included the following:

Public Law 89–698, the International Education Act of 1966, which provides for Federal assistance in the strengthening of American educational resources for international studies and research.*

Public Law 89–750, the Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1966, designed to strengthen and improve programs of assistance for elementary and secondary schools.*

Public Law 89–752, the Higher Education Amendments of 1966, designed to strengthen and improve public and private programs of assistance for institutions of higher education.*

Public Law 89–792, the Manpower Development and Training Amendments of 1966, which include a number of amendments respecting education and training under that act.*

Public Law 89–794, the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1966, which contain a number of provisions respecting education and training.*

Public Law 89–358, which provides educational and other benefits for veterans of service after January 31, 1955.*

Public Law 89–511, which amended the Library Services and Construction Act, extending titles I and II, adding two new titles, and authorizing appropriations.*

Public Law 89–688, which authorized the establishment of sea-grant colleges and programs of education, training, and research in marine science and related disciplines.*

Public Law 89–454, which provided for a comprehensive, long-range coordinated national program in marine science, including education and training in marine science.*

Public Law 89–634, which gave effect to the Agreement for Facilitating the International Circulation of Visual and Auditory Materials of an Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Character, approved at Beirut in 1948.*

Public Law 89–642, the Child Nutrition Act of 1966, which strengthened and expanded the National School Lunch Act.*

Public Law 89–651, which facilitates the international flow of educational, scientific, and cultural materials.*

Public Law 89–670, which contains a specific authorization for the Secretary of Transportation to enter into contracts with educational institutions for scientific and technological research.*

Public Law 89–672, which authorizes Interior Department research contracts with educational institutions, et cetera.*

Public Law 89–754, the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966, which contains several provisions concerning education and training.*

Public Law 89–791, which authorized the establishment in the District of Columbia of a 4-year college of arts and sciences.*

Public Law 89–751, the Allied Health Professions Personnel Training Act of 1966, which amended the Public Health Service Act to increase the opportunities for training of medical technologists and personnel in other allied health professions, and otherwise provides aid to training in allied health professions.*

Public Law 89–376, which enlarged educational programs for the advancement of health and safety in coal mines.

Public Law 89–455, which authorizes payment of certain expenses associated with the travel of veterans in connection with vocational rehabilitation (which usually includes education or training), or counseling.

Public Law 89–601, the Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1966, which contain certain provisions relating to education and training.

Public Law 89–694, which authorized the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to enter into an agreement for the establishment and operation of a model secondary school for the deaf.

Public Law 89-700, which amended the Railroad Retirement Act respecting education of surviving children.

Public Law 89-709, which authorizes grants for veterinary medicine teaching facilities and loans for students of veterinary medicine.

Public Law 89-749, the Comprehensive Health Planning and Public Health Services Amendments of 1966, which contain provisions concerning education and training.

Public Law 89-785, which gives statutory recognition to education as a function of the Veterans' Administration Department of Medicine and Surgery.

Public Law 89-355, which provides for participation in the Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center for the promotion of educational exchanges and for other purposes.

Public Law 89-375, which provided for U.S. participation in the Alaska Centennial Exposition.

Public Law 89-391, which made salary adjustments for teachers in overseas schools operated by the Department of Defense.

Public Law 89-404, which authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to make grants to and finance contracts and matching or other arrangements with educational institutions, et cetera, for the conduct of water research.

Public Law 89-435, the Department of Interior and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 1967, providing certain funds for educational services and programs.

Public Law 89-457, which provides for the leasing of certain public lands for 25 years for recreational, educational, and other purposes.

Public Law 89-470, which amended earlier legislation respecting land grants to States for schools.

Public Law 89-474, the Treasury, Post Office, and Executive Office Appropriation Act, 1967, providing certain funds for training.

Public Law 89-478, which authorizes variation of the 40-hour work-week of Federal employees for educational purposes.

Public Law 89-495, which increased annuities for retired District of Columbia teachers.

Public Law 89-503, which transferred to the Smithsonian Institution the title to certain objects of art.

Public Law 88-509, which amended previous legislation relating to the National Air Museum of the Smithsonian Institution.

Public Law 89-522, which authorizes the furnishing of certain books and other materials to handicapped persons.

Public Law 89-528, which authorized appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for fiscal 1967, including authorization for research and development grants to nonprofit institutions of higher education.

Public Law 89-546, which authorized a Presidential proclamation of "International Literacy Day."

Public Law 89-555, the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1967, including certain appropriations supporting educational and training activities.

Public Law 89-556, the Department of Agriculture and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1967, providing certain funds usable for the support of educational programs, and other funds affecting education.

Public Law 89-572, which authorized $110 million for the Peace Corps in fiscal 1967 and otherwise amends the Peace Corps Act.

Public Law 89-583, the Foreign Assistance Act of 1966, authorizing certain appropriations usable in part for educational and training purposes.

Public Law 89-588, which reformed the method by which the University of Alaska may acquire land for its support.

Public Law 89-594, which authorized in the District of Columbia, an increase in the amount of insurance with respect to student loans.

Public Law 89-620, which conveyed certain lands and improvements thereon to the University of Alaska.

Public Law 89-628, which amended the charter of Trinity College of Washington, D.C.

Public Law 89-631, which amended the charter of Georgetown University.

Public Law 89-639, which amended the charter of Southeastern University in Washington, D.C.

Public Law 89-650, which amended earlier legislation respecting the nomination and selection of candidates for the service academies.

Public Law 89-665, which established a historic properties preservation program and provides for the encouragement of education and training in historic preservation.

Public Law 89-674, which assigns the Director of the National Museum certain specific responsibilities.

Public Law 89-685, which provided for U.S. participation in the HemisFair 1968 exposition.

Public Law 89-687, the Department of Defense Appropriation Act, 1967, which made available to the Department of Defense large funds for educational and training purposes.

Public Law 89-691, which made 1967 appropriations for foreign assistance, widely involving education and training.

Public Law 89-697, the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1967, which made a number of appropriations affecting education and training or usable in whole or in part for education and training.

Public Law 89-716, which authorizes quarters and utilities without charge to civilian instructors at the Military Academy.

Public Law 89-734, which established rates of compensation for certain positions within the Smithsonian Institution.

Public Law 89-787, the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare Appropppriation Act, 1967, which provided major appropriations for educational and training purposes.

Public Law 89-790, which provided for a study of facilities and services for visitors and students coming to the Nation's Capital.

Public Law 89-797, the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriation Act for fiscal 1967, including a number of appropriations usable in whole or in part for educational and training purposes.

Public Law 89-802, which authorizes instruction of persons from countries friendly to the United States, at the U.S. service academies.

CHAPTER 4. HISTORY, ORGANIZATION, AND FUNCTIONS OF THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION AND OF THE NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION[1]

The two, and only two, agencies of the Federal Government which have education as their "primary concern"[2] are the Office of Education (in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare), and the National Science Foundation. This chapter will briefly present information, not brought together elsewhere, concerning the history, organization, and functions of each of these agencies.

A. OFFICE OF EDUCATION, DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

1. Establishment, Position, and Basic Purpose

Interest in the establishment of an office, bureau, or department of education in the Federal Government was stimulated by the census of 1840, which was the first census in which educational statistics were included. Thereafter, Henry Barnard and other educational leaders and organizations such as the National Teachers Association actively campaigned for a national bureau of education. At their meeting in Washington, D.C., in 1866, the National Association of State and City School Superintendents presented a memorial to the Congress urging the creation of such a bureau.[3] Subsequently a bill creating a national educational agency was introduced into the Congress by Representative, later President, James A. Garfield of Ohio. This bill, enacted into legislation and signed by President Johnson on March 2, 1867, established a Federal "Department of Education," headed by a Commissioner.[4]

Subsequent congressional and Executive actions have several times changed both the name of this agency and its position in the Federal structure. Originally independent, the Office was lodged in the Department of the Interior from 1869 until 1939, when it became a constituent unit of the newly created Federal Security Agency. By Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1953 and an act approved April 1, 1953, the Federal Security Agency became the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The title "Office of Education" was first applied to the agency in an act of July 20, 1868, which took effect June 30, 1869.[5] In 1870 the name was changed to Bureau of Education. The agency bore this name until 1929, when the title "Office of Education" was restored.[6] This has since remained the official name of the agency, although in the intervening years various bills have been introduced to reestablish it as a Department of Education.

---

[1] [illegible]on is expressed particularly to Mr. A. B. Brevard and Mr. Walter A. Coyne, of the Office of Education and to Mr. Clarence C. Ohlke of the National Science Foundation for supplying some of the information for this chapter.

[2] The Federal Government and Education, H. Doc. 159, 88th Cong., first sess., 1963, p. 2.

[3] Warren, Charles, "Answers to Inquiries About the U.S. Bureau of Education," Washington, Government Printing Office, 1883, p. 9.

[4] 14 Stat. 434.

[5] 15 Stat. 92, 106.

The primary purpose of the Office of Education as set forth in the establishing act of March 2, 1867, is to collect such statistics and facts as shall show the conditions and progress of education, and to diffuse such information as shall aid the people of the United States in the establishment and maintenance of efficient school systems. Subsequent acts and Executive orders have added responsibilities for Federal grants-in-aid to education, cooperative research, special programs and studies, and other functions.

2. GROWTH OF ACTIVITIES

The act establishing the Office of Education required that:

> In the first report made by the Commissioner of Education under this act, there shall be presented a statement of the several grants of land made by Congress to promote education, and the manner in which these several trusts have been managed, the amount of funds arising therefrom, and the annual proceeds of the same, as far as the same can be determined.

This mandate, along with the statutory assignment to collect "such statistics and facts as shall show the condition and progress of education in the several States," initiated the Office as essentially a research and reporting agency.

The several grants of land made by Congress to promote education which were audited by the Department of Education during its first year included those provided for the land-grant institutions under the Morrill Act of 1862.

Also in the first year of the operation of the Department of Education, the Congress requested the Commissioner to report on education in the District of Columbia. This report was the first of many surveys and studies of local and State school systems and educational institutions which have been reported by the principal Federal educational agency at intervals throughout its history.

In March 1885 the Secretary of the Interior delegated to the Commissioner of Education the responsibility placed upon the Secretary by the Congress for the education of children of school age in the Territory of Alaska. In 1905, however, the responsibility for the education of white children and children of mixed blood leading a civilized life devolved upon the Governor of Alaska. In 1932 the duty of providing for the education of Eskimos and Indians of Alaska was assigned to the Bureau of Indian Affairs in the Department of the Interior.

The second Morrill Act, approved August 30, 1890, placed upon the Secretary of the Interior certain responsibilities regarding the administration of the land-grant colleges and universities. The Secretary delegated these duties to the Bureau of Education. The Bureau or Office of Education has since administered these duties, including Federal grants-in-aid for the further endowment and support of the land-grant institutions.

---

[6] U.S. Department of the Interior. "The Office of Education: Duties, Work, History, Publications," 1935, p. 9.

On April 12, 1892, the President approved a congressional joint resolution to encourage the establishment and endowment of institutions of learning at the National Capital by defining the policy of the Government with reference to the use of its literary and scientific collections by students. The resolution provided for scientific investigators and students to have free access, under certain conditions, to Government collections and libraries. Included among agencies named to render such services was the Bureau of Education.

One of the few acts of Congress directly affecting the primary function of the Office (that of collecting and disseminating information) was approved May 28, 1896. In part the act declared that:

> The Commissioner of Education is hereby authorized to prepare and publish a bulletin of the Bureau of Education as to the condition of higher education, technical and industrial education, facts as to compulsory attendance in the schools, and such other educational topics in the several States of the Union and in foreign countries as may be deemed of value to the educational interests of the States, and there shall be printed one edition of not exceeding 12,500 copies of each issue of said bulletin for distribution by the Bureau of Education. * * *

In 1914 the Commissioner of Education promulgated certain guiding principles for the Bureau of Education which indicate the nature and extent of the responsibilities being exercised by the Bureau after nearly 50 years of service. Specifically the Commissioner declared the duties of the Bureau to be:

> 1. To serve as a clearinghouse of information in regard to education in the several States of the Union and in all the countries of the world.
> 2. To make careful and thorough studies of schools, school systems, and other agencies of education, of their organization and management, of methods of teaching and of such problems of education as may from time to time assume special importance, and to give to the people the results of these studies and also the results of similar investigations made by other agencies.
> 3. To give, upon request, expert opinion and advice to State, county, and city officials, and to respond to appeals from individuals and organizations for advice and suggestions for the promotion of education in any part of the country.
> 4. To serve as a common ground of meeting and a point of correlation for all educational agencies of whatever grade, both public and private, throughout the country.
> 5. To serve as a point of contact in education between the United States and other countries.
> 6. To cooperate with any and all persons, organizations and agencies in working out higher and better ideals of education, holding them before the people for their inspiration, and formulating practical plans for their attainment.

The Federal Vocational Education Act (the Smith-Hughes Act) of 1917 established as an independent agency the Federal Board for Vocational Education to administer the act, and to make studies and reports to aid in the organization and conduct of vocational education in public secondary schools. In 1920 the Board received also the responsibility for administering the Vocational Rehabilitation Act of that year providing for the vocational rehabilitation of persons disabled in industry. In 1933 the functions of the Federal Board for Vocational Education were transferred by Executive order to the Department of the Interior. The Board became an advisory body. The Secretary of the Interior delegated its former functions to the Office of Education. The Office has since administered these functions except those relating to vocational rehabilitation, which in 1943 were established in a separate Office of Vocational Rehabilitation within the Federal Security Agency (now the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare).

An act of Congress in 1928 charged the Bureau of Education to make an annual inspection of Howard University.

Utilizing Federal emergency relief funds allotted to it, the Office of Education during the economic depression of the 1930's carried out a number of large educational projects giving work to unemployed persons. The Office also gave assistance to the Civilian Conservation Corps and the National Youth Administration in the administration of their educational programs.

The Office administered several emergency programs during World War II. On June 23, 1940, the Congress authorized a program of training workers for war production, which was administered by the Office of Education. This became known as the war production training program. It involved distribution of funds through State boards for vocational education to pay the cost of approved training programs, and resulted in the training of about 7,500,000 workers for war industries. Appropriations for this program totaled $279 million.

Also in October 1940, the Congress authorized the Office of Education to administer a program in cooperation with degree-granting colleges and universities for the organization of short courses of college grade designed to meet the shortage of engineers, chemists, physicists, and production supervisors. This was called the engineering, science, and management war training program. More than 2 million workers for war industries were trained under this program. Appropriations for this work totaled $60 million.

The Office of Education also administered a visual-aids-for-war-training program during World War II. The Office used appropriations totaling $3,500,000 for the development of nearly 1,000 educational films and also other visual aid tools to accelerate war training.

The student war loans program administered by the Office of Education provided assistance to over 11,000 students taking training in designated technical and professional fields. A total of $5 million was appropriated for this purpose.

In October 1940, the Congress established a program for the training of rural war production workers, which was assigned to the administration of the Office of Education. This program was designed to provide training in such areas as the repair and maintenance of farm machinery, food production, and food conservation. Originally known as the out-of-school-youth training program, it was finally called the rural war production training program. In this program 4,200,000 students participated. The total appropriation amounted to $59,500,000.

During the war the Office cooperated with a number of other Government agencies in carrying out programs related to education. Among these activities were the provision of Federal aid under the Lanham Act for the construction and operation of schools in areas particularly affected by Federal activities, extended school services for the care of children of working mothers, salvage programs, and school transportation arrangements.

After the war the Office cooperated with the War Assets Administration in a large-scale program of channeling surplus war materials to schools and colleges. The Office also discharged a responsibility assigned to it by Public Law 697, 79th Congress. This act required that the Commissioner of Education determine the educational needs of schools and higher institutions which requested that surplus buildings and facilities be donated to them in order that they might increase their enrollments of veterans.

The school assistance acts of 1950 assigned the Office of Education responsibility for the administration of funds appropriated under these acts to assist in construction of school facilities and in the maintenance and operation of schools in areas affected by Federal activities.

Responsibilities of the Office of Education began to expand rapidly with the passage of the National Defense Education Act of 1958. Five years later the Congress passed the first of many major laws concerning education and training enacted from 1963 through 1967. The total budget of the Office rose from approximately $700 million in 1963 to about $3.9 billion for the fiscal year 1967.

Among the more significant of the recent laws concerning education and training which the Office of Education participates in administering are the Vocational Education Act of 1963, the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963, the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, the Higher Education Act of 1965, and the Education Professions Development Act of 1967. Detailed information on legislation concerning education and training enacted since 1961 is given in chapter 3 of this report.

3. PRESENT ORGANIZATION AND FUNCTIONS

The Office of Education is the only Federal agency that is concerned with education at all levels and in all phases. It identifies what it considers to be needs and weaknesses in American education, proposes ways and means of filling these needs and overcoming these weaknesses, and provides professional and financial assistance for doing educational and training jobs that it considers the States acting alone or in groups cannot do or cannot do efficiently.

The Office of Education is a constituent agency of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Headed by the Commissioner of Education, the Office is organized in seven staff and service offices, each directed by an Assistant Commissioner of Education; and five bureaus, each directed by an Associate Commissioner. In general the assistant Commissioners manage the internal business of the Office—personnel, financial, and legal—and handle its relations with the Congress, the administration, and other agencies, and with the public press. The Associate Commissioners direct the programs conducted by the bureaus, including the administration of grants.

The bureaus deal with matters pertaining to (1) elementary and secondary education; (2) adult, vocational, and library programs; (3) higher education; (4) education of the handicapped, and (5) research. Each bureau carries on its work through administrative divisions and branches.

The appropriation for salaries and expenses of the Office of Education for the fiscal year 1967 was $35,150,000. The amount appropriated to the Office for grants and other programs was $3,866,525,000, making a total appropriation of $3,901,675,000 for the fiscal year 1967. The present staff consists of 2,728 full-time professional and clerical workers.

OFFICE OF THE COMMISSIONER

Appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, the U.S. Commissioner of Education is the officer of the Federal Government responsible for the efficient and effective operation of the Office of Education for the administration of its programs established by legislation, and for the performance of other functions assigned to him by the Congress and by the Executive Office of the President. Among the major activities of the Commissioner are determining policy and program objectives, providing executive leadership for the operations of the policies and programs, rendering consultative service to educational agencies, and advising with National, State, and local officials and international bodies on educational problems.

A Deputy Commissioner participates in the administration of the Office and development of policies, with major responsibility for planning and coordination.

The Associate Commissioner for Federal-State relations serves as the Commissioner's principal adviser on Federal-State relations and principal mediator when differences arise. He also stimulates Office programs aimed at improving the leadership of State agencies.

An Associate Commissioner for international education recommends policy for Office programs and activities in international education, coordinating both programs and activities. He serves as Office liaison with other Federal departments and with private organizations on international education.

The Associate Commissioner for field services coordinates Office programs in the field. Through the staffs of nine regional offices he assists States, local agencies, and institutions in carrying out programs and advises them on Federal policies and laws.

Staff and service offices, which report directly to the Commissioner of Education, include: (1) Office of Construction Service; (2) Office of Administration; (3) Office of Information; (4) Office of Legislation; (5) Office of Program Planning and Evaluation; (6) Office of Programs for the Disadvantaged; and (7) National Center for Educational Statistics.

Office of Construction Service.—Leadership and consultative services are offered by this Office in the areas of building, planning, and development. Beneficiaries are educational agencies and institutions of all levels. Administration of construction activity funded under Office of Education programs also is the responsibility of this Office.

Office of Administration.—This Office plans, directs, and coordinates the administrative, financial, and personnel programs of the Office of Education. It is responsible for use of manpower; management of records; preparation of the budget; financial standards, fiscal services, and accounting procedures; recruitment, placement, classification, and training of employees; procurement of space and equipment; management and control of property; mail and messenger services; and distribution of publications. It also represents the Office of Education in its business dealings with the Department, the Bureau of the Budget, congressional appropriations committees, the Civil Service Commission, the Treasury Department, the General Services Administration, and other Government agencies.

Office of Information.—Acquainting the public with Office of Education activities is the principal work of the Office of Information. It performs this work by means of news releases, official statements, articles, messages, and a variety of additional written materials. It publishes the official journal of the Office; namely, American Education magazine. The staff works with the bureaus on a publications program, producing statistical and informational booklets, pamphlets, and bulletins. The Office of Information provides professional services for manuscripts produced by the Office of Education and outside individuals and, in matters of information and publishing, represents the Office in relations with other Federal organizations.

Office of Legislation.—Proposals for legislation considered by the Office of Education to be necessary to the objectives of education and to the functions of the Office of Education are prepared by this Office. It also has the responsibility for coordinating the preparation of testimony and arranging for the appearance of Office of Education witnesses before all education-related congressional committees except the Appropriations Committees. The staff provides information and services to organizations and individuals, including Members of Congress, congressional committees, other Federal agencies, State departments of education, local school officials, and interested citizens. It analyzes and prepares reports on proposed bills and on the content, status, and progress of congressional bills and interprets recently enacted legislation. The staff makes a continuing study of school laws in the States as one means of keeping informed on problems and actions affecting education. It also conducts a reference and resource service on educational legislative proposals.

Office of Program Planning and Evaluation.—Responsibilities of this Office include coordinating the activities of bureaus and other staff offices in identifying problems and trends in education, making long-range plans, and setting up long-range goals for Office of Education programs. It analyzes program operations and recommends policy or programs on problems of national concern. It also studies the influence of Federal programs on education and recommends modifications when necessary.

Office of Programs for the Disadvantaged.—With education of the disadvantaged—policy, program, research, and legislation—as its concern, this Office has special responsibility, assigned to it by the Commissioner of Education, for coordinating the educational components of community action programs, administered by the Office of Economic Opportunity, with Office of Education programs for students from low-income families. It maintains liaison with pertinent Office of Education units, with other agencies of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and other Federal departments to exchange information concerning needs of the disadvantaged and programs to fill those needs.

National Center for Educational Statistics.—The design and administration of all statistical information programs of the Office of Education are carried out by the Center. It coordinates collection of statistics on all programs, and assists other units in the Office and the field in applying and using data-processing systems and services. It also develops comprehensive analytical models of the operational structure of American education, and uses them in the study of policy, budget allocation, and evaluation of Federal education programs.

Division of Automatic Data Processing: All ADP machine processing, storage, and reporting of quantitative information required by the Office of Education is handled in this Division. The Division provides ADP systems analysis, programing services, and computer operations support for all operating bureaus and staff offices, including all advanced design and management information systems.

Division of Statistical Operations: Analysis and publication of statistics on all levels of education are two of the functions of this Division. It also designs and maintains the general statistical information system of the Office of Education. It develops sampling plans for all Office of Education surveys and makes studies aimed at improving techniques for collecting and analyzing statistical information. The Division serves the Office, other agencies, and the public as the general source of information on educational statistics, including references, estimates, and projections. It assists States, local school districts, and institutions of higher education in developing standard terminology and reporting procedures, assures compliance with the Federal Reports Act, and administers the forms management program of the Office.

Division of Operations Analysis: This Division develops quantitative computer-based models of how our schools and colleges are organized and what forces within them are apt to produce change. The Division also assesses the possibble impact on education of proposed social and economic changes and investigates alternative educational policies to encourage desired changes.

Division of Data Analysis and Dissemination: Answering requests from the Congres, State education agencies, and others for information already in the Center's data banks is a function of this Division. It also provides references, estimates, and projections of statistical information on education. Another responsibility is to analyze data on hand to determine the interrelationships, for example, of variables such as the size of a high school, the availability of science courses in the school, and admission of its graduates to prestige colleges and universities.

BUREAU OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

Federal programs designed to improve elementary and secondary schools are administered by this Bureau. These programs provide the grants-in-aid and loans authorized by such legislation as the National Defense Education Act of 1958 (NDEA) and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA).

Office of the Associate Commissioner.—The associate commissioner directs the planning, operation, and evaluation of programs but delegates authority for the day-to-day administration to directors of the six divisions of the bureau and the Office of the Teacher Corps.

Division of Plans and Supplementary Centers: This division administers a variety of programs providing grants to the States and local education agencies for these purposes: (1) To support supplementary centers and services under title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. (2) To provide for instructional materials and equipment, minor remodeling, and State supervisory services to strengthen instruction in various subject areas. (3) To provide for equipment, materials, and minor remodeling to strengthen instruction in the arts and humanities. (4) To provide school library resources, textbooks, and other instructional materials. (5) To establish, maintain, and improve guidance, counseling, and testing services for State and local school systems. (6) To stimulate interest of students in science through out-of-school science clubs.

Division of State Agency Cooperation: Grants to States are used to improve their departments of education by developing professional staff, identifying problems, evaluating programs, undertaking comprehensive educational planning, and conducting research. The division makes special grants to State agencies for interstate experimental or creative projects or services that hold promise of contributing to the solution of problems common to several States.

Division of School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas: Grants are made by this division for construction, maintenance, and operation of schools in districts where Federal activities have increased school enrollment or reduced school revenue by taking property off local tax rolls. Grants are also made when a local school district provides free public education for children who live or whose parents are employed on Federal property. The division also administers grants for other similar programs, as well as grants to Dade County, Fla., public schools for educational programs for Cuban refugees.

Division of Educational Personnel Training: This division administers four programs designed to help teachers, supervisors, and specialists in elementary and secondary schools increase their teaching skills and subject knowledge: (1) Institutes for advanced study for teachers of certain subjects, teachers of disadvantaged youth, and specialists in educational media; (2) guidance and counseling institutes open to counselors and teachers preparing to be counselors; (3) institutes to strengthen the teaching of arts and humanities; and (4) fellowships for experienced teachers to provide graduate study for up to 2 years. The division is also responsible for international teacher exchange programs and summer seminars abroad for American teachers and administrators; international teacher development programs; and technical assistance training for teachers and administrators from developing countries.

Division of Compensatory Education: Assisting States in administering programs for "educationally deprived" children is the major function of this division. Grants are made to State agencies for such programs in local educational agencies to improve the education of children in low-income areas, and in State-supported and State-controlled schools for neglected, delinquent, and handicapped children. The division also evaluates the success of its programs and recommends effective ways to use funds, provides information on developments and problems in educating poor children, and gives advice on ways to meet their educational needs.

Division of Equal Educational Opportunities: A former responsibility of this Division, namely the enforcement phase (title VI) of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, was transferred to the Office of the Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in the fall of 1967. However the Division of Equal Educational Opportunities still administers a program, authorized under title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, to help schools eliminate segregation. The division provides technical assistance in preparing and implementing plans for public school desegregation. It makes grants to local school boards for advisory specialists and/or in-service training programs to deal with problems growing out of desegregation. It also arranges for short-term or regular-session training institutes to improve the ability of teachers and other school personnel to handle problems related to school desegregation.

Office of the Teacher Corps.—The Teacher Corps provides specially trained teachers for children in low-income districts. Teams of experienced teacher-interns led by an experienced teacher are recruited to work in these districts. Colleges and universities provide special training.

BUREAU OF ADULT, VOCATIONAL, AND LIBRARY PROGRAMS

Helping young people and adults learn new job skills that will enable them to compete in today's labor market is a major function of this bureau. The bureau administers Federal programs of vocational school construction, vocational and technical education, manpower development and training and basic education courses for adults in reading, writing, arithmetic, and consumer buying. The bureau also funds programs in continuing education to solve community problems, college library assistance and training, public library services and construction, adult education in civil defense and radiological monitoring, and construction of educational television broadcasting facilities.

Office of the Associate Commissioner.—While this office coordinates the program activities of the Bureau's four divisions, its major responsibilities are policy planning, program development and evaluation, and public information. To fulfill these obligations the Associate Commissioner and his staff work with State education and library agencies, higher education institutions, national advisory committees, other Federal agencies, educational television commissions, professional associations, representatives of industry, agriculture, and labor.

Division of Vocational and Technical Education: This division makes grants to the States for vocational and technical education, counseling and guidance, teacher training, and for construction and operation of area vocational schools. The States reimburse local schools for their program costs. The division cooperates with State officials in developing plans and procedures for local school training operations and approves State plans.

Division of Manpower Development and Training: Grants to States for all institutional training conducted under the Manpower Development and Training Act (MDTA) channel through this division. In administering grants, the division works with State education agencies, private educational associations and agencies, employment agencies, and local school systems to select sites, equipment, curriculum, and teachers for MDTA training. The staff also works with other

Federal agencies in drafting recommendations on programs needed and on ways of improving current programs.

Division of Library Services and Educational Facilities: Assistance to college and public libraries, as well as to educational television, is the program focus of this division. To improve public libraries the division funds programs for services and construction, interlibrary cooperation, and specialized State library services. The division administers the college library resources and library training programs under title II of the Higher Education Act of 1965. It helps States to determine how best to allocate funds for development of library services. The division also makes grants to local and State educational agencies, public colleges, and other institutions to purchase and install television broadcasting facilities.

Division of Adult Education Programs: Designed to give older school dropouts and others a second chance to acquire the simplest of educational tools, the adult basic education program is administered by this Division. It also operates community service and continuing education programs, as well as a civil defense adult education programs delegated to the Office of Education by the Department of the Army.

BUREAU OF HIGHER EDUCATION

With responsibility for 25 programs to strengthen colleges and universities, the Bureau administers several student financial aid activities and offers assistance to institutions for scholarships and fellowships, for improving curriculums and faculty, for construction of academic buildings, and for equipment. The Bureau has four divisions, all under the direction of the Associate Commissioner for Higher Education.

Office of the Associate Commissioner.—This Office bears overall responsibility for planning, conducting, and evaluating Bureau programs and determining the eligibility of institutions to participate in them. It publishes annually "Education Directory: Part 3, Higher Education" and a list of nationally recognized accrediting associations, and miscellaneous pamphlets and bulletins.

Division of College Support: Two programs funded under the Higher Education Act of 1965 are administered by this Division. One provides financial support for cooperative arrangements between strong colleges and universities and developing institutions. The other is designed to improve college instruction by providing institutes and workshops in the use of educational media for faculty members. The Division makes grants to and contracts with the institutions which conduct the enterprises.

Division of Graduate Programs: To improve graduate education, this Division makes grants to colleges and universities and to controlling boards of cooperative graduate centers for the construction or expansion of facilities for graduate schools. It also awards 3-year fellowships for students who are in approved doctoral programs and who plan to become college teachers. To persons teaching now or planning to teach in elementary and secondary schools the Division awards 2-year fellowships for study leading to a master's or equivalent degree.

Both fellowship programs include allowances to the institutions providing the instruction.

Division of Student Financial Aid: The Higher Education Act of 1965 authorizes four programs administered by this Division to help students finance their college education. The programs consist of low-interest loans to students, grants to colleges and universities for awards to exceptionally needy students, grants to pay a portion of salaries for the part-time employment of needy students, and low-interest loans to vocational students. The Division makes agreements with States and with private agencies to insure the loans made to students by banks and other lenders, to advance funds to establish or strengthen reserves at the State level used to guarantee student loans, and to pay the interest charges on loans made to students. The Division also contracts with institutions and organizations to conduct "talent search" programs to identify able high school students and motivate them to complete secondary school and enter postsecondary training.

Division of College Facilities: The function of this Division is to provide funds to help colleges and universities improve academic facilities. Grants and loans are made to institutions for the construction, rehabilitation, or improvement of classrooms, laboratories, and similar facilities. Grants are also made for laboratory and other special equipment, and for television equipment and other materials for closed-circuit instruction. A program of grants to State commissions helps them in planning for higher education facilities. Funds for the continuing support of land-grant colleges also channel through this Division.

BUREAU OF RESEARCH

Nearly all Office of Education research programs conducted by individuals and groups outside the Office are administered by the Bureau of Research. Exceptions include research on education of the handicapped and certain statistical surveys. The Bureau's purpose is to improve education by acquiring new information on how people learn, by developing instructional materials and practices, and by finding ways to improve educational services. Through contracts and grants the Bureau supports basic and applied research studies and surveys, for development of materials and techniques, for demonstration of their effectiveness, for dissemination of information resulting from research, for construction of regional research facilities, and for training personnel in educational research and related fields. The Bureau includes the Office of the Associate Commissioner and five divisions.

Office of the Associate Commissioner.—The associate commissioner advises the Commissioner on current developments in research. His Office directs all Bureau activities, identifies problems on which research is needed, stimulates proposals for research, seeks advice from specialists on proposals submitted, and evaluates both proposals and completed project. The staff also manages the arts and humanities program, which is responsible for research activities in the arts and humanities and for liaison with other groups working in arts and humanities. The regional research program, which operates through the nine regional offices of the Office of Education, is also in the Office of the Associate Commissioner. The staff administers projects requiring

$10,000 or less in Federal funds and directs a program for developing research capacities of higher education institutions.

Division of Elementary-Secondary Education Research: The Division supports research and related activities in elementary and secondary education, with emphasis on preschool, elementary, and intermediate levels. Support is provided for the following areas: Development of curriculums and administrative techniques; studies of the psychology and physiology of learning; investigations of social and economic factors which affect learning; improvement of pupil personnel services; imaginative applications of technology and media; and research on education abroad. Funds are also available for field testing and demonstration of new materials and techniques, for information dissemination, and for research on improving programs to train administrative, instructional, and supporting staff at the preschool through intermediate levels.

Division of Higher Education Research: Financial support is provided by this division for basic research studies related to education at the undergraduate and graduate levels. Study areas include development, evaluation, field testing, and demonstration of materials, methods, and instructional and support systems designed to improve educational research and practice; and research and development related to the organization and administration of education in colleges and universities. Support for the training of educational researchers and curriculum development specialists is an additional concern of the Division.

Division of Comprehensive and Vocational Education Research: Responsibility for administering research and related experimental, demonstration, and training projects for secondary, postsecondary, community college, and adult education rests with this Division. Training of staff for these programs is an additional area of responsibility. Funding is provided for basic educational research studies; development, evaluation and field testing of instructional materials and practices; organization and administration studies; and career opportunities project. Diffusion of research findings and educational innovations is a major division function. Also emphasized are experimental and pilot programs in technical and vocational education for young people in economically depressed communities.

Division of Education Laboratories: Two new programs are administered by this Division: the regional educational laboratories and the research and development centers. The 20 regional laboratories work with local schools, State departments of education, and other educational organizations to select promising research and development activities, evaluate their potential and demonstrate their effectiveness, adapt materials and techniques for practical use in the schools, and inform educators about the tools and techniques that seem to work best. At research and development centers, most of them located at universities, research efforts are concentrated on continuous improvement in broad areas such as teacher education, higher education, individualized instruction, urban education, and the effects of cultural differences on children's learning.

Division of Information Technology and Dissemination: This Division supports research on educational uses of information and information technology, such as research and demonstration activities related to library and information sciences and to the educational uses of information systems and equipment as well as other innovations. Another activity is promoting in educational settings, through films, demonstrations, and printed media, the use of research-based innovations. Interpretive reports are published which digest research findings in nontechnical language for teachers and other school personnel. The division also distributes research information through the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) and the Educational Materials Center.

BUREAU OF EDUCATION FOR THE HANDICAPPED

Established in 1967, this Bureau has consolidated and now administers all Office of Education programs relating to the education and training of physically or mentally handicapped children and youth, and research pertaining to teaching the handicapped. The bureau helps handicapped children become independent and self-sufficient through programs to: (1) increase the number of qualified professional personnel; (2) improve educational services in preschool and school programs; (3) stimulate acquisition and utilization of modern educational equipment and teaching materials; and (4) encourage research and the use of successfully tested research and advanced educational techniques. The Bureau is composed of the Office of the Associate Commissioner and three divisions.

Office of the Associate Commissioner.—Responsible for program planning, administration, and evaluation, this office also provides an informational service on the handicapped for the Nation's educational community. The associate commissioner and his staff work in cooperation with the National Advisory Committee for Handicapped Children, State educational agencies, higher educational institutions, public and nonprofit organizations, and professional associations to develop and stimulate innovative educational enterprises for handicapped children and youth.

Division of Educational Services: Three programs are administered by this Division. The first provides grants to State departments of education to aid them in initiating, expanding, and improving programs at the preschool, elementary, and secondary levels which advance the education of handicapped children. The second furnishes grants to State departments of education for projects designed to meet educational needs of handicapped children in State-operated and State-supported schools. Finally, a captioned films and educational media loan service is provided on a nationwide scale for the educational, cultural, and vocational enrichment of handicapped persons. Contracts are made for production of captioned films, for research and development, and training in the use of media.

Division of Training Programs: Through grants to institutions of higher learning and to State departments of education, this Division supports training programs for teachers, supervisors, speech and hearing specialists, and other professional personnel concerned with the education of handicapped children. Grants are used for junior or senior year college traineeships or graduate fellowships for full-time study, special study institutes, summer session full-time traineeships, and to stimulate the development of new education and training programs for teachers and other specialists of the handicapped at colleges and universities.

Division of Research: This Division supports research facility construction, research and development centers, research programs and projects, and provides grants to stimulate university departments concerned with the handicapped. The Division also supports a variety of demonstration and dissemination activities. It also provides funds for projects which develop and evaluate educational media and curriculums.

B. NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

1. Origin and Development of Programs

The idea of a Federal agency devoted to the progress of science and organized along the lines of major private foundations was born before World War II had ended. Recognizing the need for a Federal agency responsible for advancing all branches of American science and organized so as to be sensitive to the views of the general scientific community, the Congress established the National Science Foundation (NSF) in May 1950.

The statute creating the NSF, as amended, authorizes and directs it, among other things, to "support basic scientific research and programs to strengthen scientific research potential," "to award scholarships and graduate fellowships in the sciences," and "to foster the interchange of scientific information among scientists." At first, the Foundation pursued these objectives mainly by: (1) providing support for basic research in the form of project grants, given on the basis of scientific merit, for highest quality work of individuals or small groups of scientists at universities; and (2) awarding graduate and postdoctoral fellowships in the sciences.

In fiscal year 1952, the first year in which funds were available, 96 project research grants were made to 59 institutions in 33 States and the District of Columbia. Fifteen years later, in fiscal year 1967, 3,972 project research grants amounting to $172 million were made to over 400 institutions in 49 States and the District of Columbia.

Several important advances in support of research by NSF took place in 1956. NSF, for the first time, provided major assistance for procurement of science facilities. Also, perliminary steps were taken in 1956 which led to the establishment of the National Radio Astronomy Observatory at Green Bank, W. Va., and the Kitt Peak National Observatory in Arizona, both now operated for NSF by associations of universities. Studies begun in 1956 by the National Academy of Sciences led to the establishment by NSF (in 1960) of a third national research center: the National Center for Atmospheric Research at Boulder, Colo.—also operated by an association of universities. Another national research center, the Cerro Tololo Inter-American Observatory, was established in 1963 by NSF for astronomical observations in the Southern Hemisphere. This Observatory is operated by the same association of universities which operates the Kitt Peak Observatory.

Participation by the United States in the International Geophysical Year (IGY) made 1957 a year of notable advancement for the NSF. It was the first national research program, and was followed by others.

Over the years, the NSF has gradually devised other basic research support programs for major items of equipment, such as computers, nuclear accelerators, and specialized facilities such as oceanographic research vessels.

Like the support provided for basic research, NSF activity in the field of science education dates back to the first year of operation. The initial program of fellowships for the academic year 1952–53 provided awards at both the predoctoral and postdoctoral levels to 624 candidates selected on the basis of national competition. This emphasis on academic excellence continues as a key element of NSF science education and has been expanded with advanced postdoctoral training, and science faculty fellowships.

Beginning in the fiscal year 1964, the National Science Foundation began its graduate traineeship program to more fully utilize the capacity of a large number of institutions to provide training for graduate students in the sciences and engineering. Under this program, the institution applies for the number of traineeships it believes it needs in the various eligible fields of science. Grants are awarded on the basis of departmental strength, and capacity for expanding the graduate student enrollment. Ultimate selection of the individual recipients is made by the institution.

During its first year, the traineeship program was limited to the engineering fields. This was expanded in fiscal year 1965 to include mathematical and physical sciences, and in fiscal year 1966 to include biological and social sciences. In fiscal year 1967, 8,719 fellowships and traineeships were awarded to U.S. citizens and nationals.

In the area of faculty improvement, NSF in fiscal year 1953 sponsored its first experimental summer institutes for college science teachers. In the following summer, this experimental program was expanded to secondary school teachers. The summer group training sessions have become operational programs and have been further augmented by in-service training of teachers at evening classes and a smaller number of academic year institutes given to teachers who have taken a leave of absence for the purpose of pursuing additional training. Since the inception of these programs, about 300,000 training opportunities for science teachers have been provided by NSF.

New courses and curriculums for many subjects were developed by bringing scholars of a discipline together with teachers of science in the school systems. Original efforts of this sort were directed primarily at precollege education where the need was greatest. Somewhat more recent programs of support for undergraduate education have, in large part, been of a similar nature.

A related activity in support of science education is the NSF effort to provide colleges and universities with undergraduate instructional equipment. On a matching grant basis, NSF provides assistance in procurement of laboratory equipment for undergraduate science programs, and this type of assistance has aprticularly affected large numbers of smaller colleges. At the present time, close to 1,000 grants are made annually to about half as many institutions.

A special form of college or university institutional support, initiated in 1961, is the institutional grant, an annual award of funds which may be used by the institution receiving it, for any purpose which directly supports academic science.

More recently, NSF has adopted various new measures for institutional support. Among these is the science development program, introduced in fiscal year 1965, which is directed at broad, rather rapid development of a limited number of institutions considered by the National Science Foundation to have a demonstrated potential for advancement toward the level of excellence which is now characteristic of truly outstanding institutions.

Other types of institutional support, added in the fiscal year 1967, include the departmental science development program and a college science improvement program. The departmental program is designed to enhance scientific competence in institutions where a department's research record marks it as a leader and an example for its sister departments. The college program is directed primarily at improving science education at predominantly undergraduate institutions.

In all of these programs, the aim of the National Science Foundation is to provide institutions with the means to carry out their own plans for development and to adapt to their changing needs.

In 1958 the Congress moved to strengthen and expand NSF's information function by incorporating into the National Defense Education Act a provision for the establishment of an Office of Science Information Service within NSF. A further stimulus took place in December 1958 when the President's Science Advisory Committee issued a report on "Improving the Availability of Scientific and Technical Information in the United States." The President's Committee recommended that NSF expand its scientific information program. This recommendation was later implemented by Executive Order 10807 of March 1959. These executive actions, together with the earlier National Defense Education Act of 1958, have led to a wide spectrum of activities designed to develop comprehensive information systems serving the scientific disciplines, and establishing relationships between the information systems of the professional community and those maintained by Federal agencies.

In his policy statement of September 13, 1965, entitled "Strengthening Academic Capability for Science Throughout the Country," President Johnson outlined the functions of various Government agencies in relation to strengthening academic science potential throughout the Nation. The President specifically charged NSF with responsibility for "augmenting the research capabilities of academic institutions in all fields of science through the support of basic research and research facilities and through measures for improving the quality of education in the sciences." The following day, the Federal Council for Science and Technology established an FCST Committee on Academic Science and Engineering under the chairmanship of the Director of the NSF. A principal purpose of the Committee is to gather and present statistics on agency programs that can serve as a basis for assessing future progress in the directions desired by the President.

In his health and education message to the Congress on February 28, 1967, the President directed the Foundation to work with the U.S. Office of Education to establish an experimental program for developing the potential of computers in education. The Foundation had several related computer programs already going, and in order to more fully implement the President's directive, a central Office of Computing Activities has been established. It has cognizance over all computer-related activities of the Foundation (except the support given through research grants for purchase of computer services). This Office, reporting directly to the Director of the Foundation, both administers programs itself and coordinates related activities within the Foundation. There has also been established an Interagency Committee on Computers and Education, chaired by NSF, with members from the Office of Education, Department of Defense, National Institutes of Health, and the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities.

In the course of the 17 years of its existence, the NSF has evolved a complex and interlocking system of support mechanisms for research, science education, facilities and institutions, and science information. About three-fourths of this support is committed directly to the country's academic institutions. If indirect supports are included, more than 90 per cent of NSF's total program is directly or indirectly in support of academic research or science education. According to information obtained from the National Science Foundation, although programmatic emphases may vary from year to year, this fundamental pattern developed over the years can be expected to guide the NSF in its future activities.

2. Present Organization and Functions

NSF organizational structure is unusual among Government agencies in that it provides for dual authority and responsibility between the National Science Board (NSB) and the Director of the NSF. The NSB is the policymaking body of the Foundation and is composed of 24 individuals and the Director of the NSF, ex officio. The members of the Board are drawn mostly but not entirely from the scientific and educational communities and are all appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. The term of office for Board members is 6 years.

The NSB has a unique position among the many boards, commissions, committees, and other advisory groups of the Federal Government. It is a part-time board charged with definite statutory responsibilities. To help carry out its business, the NSB has five standing committees— the Executive Committee; Committee I (Research and Science Information); Committee II (Institutional Relations); Committee III (Education); and the Science Development Awards Committee. Other ad hoc committees are established as required.

The Director of the Foundation is a full-time Presidential appointee who serves as chief executive officer of the Foundation with specific statutory responsibility assigned within the broad policy functions of the Board.

In his capacity as chief executive officer of the Foundation, the Director is assisted by a Deputy Director, three Associate Directors, the Planning Director, and other principal staff who have a status coordinate with the Associate Directors with responsibilities as indicated below:

The Associate Director/Research (AD/R) directs NSF programs involving the support of basic research and research facilities. He is responsible for four major elements of research support: (1) basic research project grants; (2) national research programs; (3) specialized university research facilities; and (4) national research centers

The Associate Director/Education (AD/E) directs programs for improving the subject-matter competence of teachers of science, mathematics, and engineering; providing support, through fellowships, traineeships, and advanced science seminars, for graduate students in science and established scientists to obtain the best advanced training available. Other programs which he directs are development of modern materials for instruction and courses of study; specialized training in science for high-ability college and high school students; and specialized facilities and equipment necessary for scientific study.

The Associate Director/Institutional Relations (AD/IR) directs programs to assist colleges and universities in their efforts to maintain and upgrade their programs and capabilities in science education and academic research.

The Planning Director (PD) is responsible for activities involving data collection, processing, and analysis; and planning and policy studies. These efforts are aimed at more effective utilization of the Nation's resources for research and education in the sciences.

In addition to the above, the head of the Office of Science Information Service makes provision for science information services and undertakes programs to develop and improve methods for processing scientific information and making it more readily available. The head of the Office of International Science Activities directs programs to strengthen U.S. science by international cooperation and aid to certain foreign countries in developing their science education resources.

In addition to the above elements of NSF organization, the Director has a Planning Council which advises him on significant program and administrative matters. The membership of the Council includes the Director (who is chairman), the Executive Assistant to the Director (who is executive secretary), the Deputy Director, the Planning Director, the Associate Directors, the General Counsel, the Head of the Office of Congressional and Public Affairs, the Administrative Manager, and the Comptroller.

According to information obtained from the National Service Foundation, in developing and carrying out its programs, the NSF has consistently relied upon the advice of the scientific community. Advisory committees, councils, and commissions serve this purpose, and each of the major operating units of NSF draws on panels of experts in the field from outside NSF. The majority of these scientists are associated on a full-time basis with universities or similar organizations. These groups serve NSF in a variety of ways, and meet as appropriate. Some of the panels are not required to convene, and the members of the panel individually review proposals which are mailed to them for evalution. All of these groups play an active part in helping decide the course that science and science education should take in the United States.

CHAPTER 5. RECOMMENDATIONS OF AD HOC ADVISORY COMMISSIONS (DECEMBER 1929–MARCH 1967)

Over a period of years a number of advisory groups of prominent laymen and educators convoked by action of the Congress, the President, or heads of Federal agencies have issued reports containing comments and recommendations concerning existing and proposed Federal activities in education. From time to time, various national advisory groups affiliated with nongovernmental organizations interested in education have added their voices to those of the governmental organizations.

Regardless of whether any one of these groups has been called a commission, committee, conference, board, or something else, the organizations here under consideration have functioned wholly or partly as advisory commissions. Their conclusions have been based upon extensive research and deliberation, usually covering a period of years. Altogether millions of dollars have been spent to finance the studies and reports of these commissions.

It may be surprising to some readers to discover that many recommendations by advisory groups years ago are still relevant to Federal educational programs today. Some of the recommendations have been put into effect, wholly or partly, by legislative or administrative action.

The published reports of these important commissions comprise many volumes, one of the committees alone having published 21 reports and staff studies. Investigation has not revealed the existence of any other comprehensive up-to-date compilation of the expressions concerning the Federal role in education that appear in these reports.

Time and space limitations of the present study do not permit inclusions of a full digest of such of the commissions' reports and staff studies as are relevant to the subject here under consideration. The purpose of this chapter is to identify certain important advisory groups of the last several decades and set forth substantially but concisely their *conclusions and recommendations which appear presently relevant to the conduct of Federal activities in the field of education and training.* Inclusion of any recommendation in this report is not intended to imply desirability or feasibility of its application to such activities.

It should be noted here that this chapter covers recommendations of commissions that are no longer active. Recommendations by presently functioning advisory groups are included in chapter 6 of this report.

A. GOVERNMENTAL ADVISORY COMMISSIONS

1. THE NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION (1929)

The National Advisory Committee on Education was appointed by President Herbert Hoover in 1929. Regarding the task of the committee, in his message to Congress on December 3 of that year the President said:

> In view of the considerable difference of opinion as to policies which should be pursued by the Federal Government with respect to education, I have appointed a committee representative of the important educational associations and others to investigate and present recommendations.

A grant of $100,000 from the Julius Rosenwald Fund financed studies made by the committee, in which assistance was obtained from a number of research collaborators and special consultants in various parts of the country.

Following is the essence of some of the broader and presently more significant findings and recommendations which the committee[1] set forth in its two-volume report:

> The multitudinous Federal educational activities are scattered throughout the various Federal departments and independent agencies, among which there is little evidence of cooperation in the discharge of educational responsibilities having the same major purpose.
>
> The Federal Government has no inclusive and consistent public policy as to what it should or should not do in the field of education. Whatever particular policies it seems to be pursuing are often inconsistent with one another; sometimes they are in conflict. They suggest a haphazard development, wherein policies of far-reaching effect have been set up as mere incidents of some special attempt to induce an immediate and particular efficiency. Establishment of a comprehensive, forward-looking, and coherent public policy in this field will be necessary to effect great improvements in the administration of Federal educational responsibilities.
>
> There are national responsibilities for education which only the Federal Government can adequately meet. The American people are justified in using their Federal tax system to give financial aid to education in the States. Federal aid should be given to education as a whole rather than to particular types of training. Requiring the matching of Federal money grants with State or local funds is an undesirable policy in the field of education.
>
> The Federal Government should develop its research and information services with increasing emphasis on comprehensive research and on the diffusion of information needed for decision on critical national issues. It should extned the educational activities of the United States in cooperation with other countries.
>
> The time has come to establish a Federal headquarters for education competent to meet the increasing national responsibility in this field. The committee recommends establishment of a Department of Education with a Secretary in the President's Cabinet.

2. THE U.S. ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION (1936)

The U.S. Advisory Committee on Education (at first called the President's Committee on Vocational Education) was appointed by President F. D. Roosevelt in 1936. In a letter to the chairman early in 1937, the President pointed out that numerous educational bills were pending in the Congress. He asked the committee to give extended consideration to the whole matter of Federal-State-local relationships in education.

The report and staff studies of the committee, together comprising 21 volumes, were printed in 1938 and 1939. The proposals of the committee relate principally to the role of the Federal Government in aid to education in the States. Several of these proposals have been put into effect to some extent through congressional action. Following is a summary of the committee's findings and recommendations:

---

[1] The representatives of Catholic and Negro education, respectively, submitted minority reports regarding establishment of a Federal Department of Education and special grants for Negro education.

Nearly every department of the Federal Government now carries out extensive educational functions.

Past Federal participation in education has been required by the fact that locally supported programs of education have never been adequate to accomplish all vital national purposes. Their relative inadequacy is increasing, not because the local programs do not improve but because they do not improve rapidly enough to meet increasing needs.

The ability of the States and local communities to provide education has always been unequal. That inequality has been magnified, however, by the recent great changes that have taken place in social and economic conditions. At the same time, education has become increasingly important.

In providing funds to more nearly equalize educational opportunity, the more efficient taxes are the Federal taxes on incomes and estates. These taxes are collected chiefly in the richer areas, where the resources available to local taxation are more than adequate for the support of schools. There are definite limits on the extent to which any individual State can use taxes based upon ability to pay, such as the income and estate taxes. These are the taxes which above all others should be used to provide funds for equalization purposes. They can be applied effectively on a large scale only by the Federal Government.

The committee recommended new Federal grants for the following educational purposes:

(1) General aid to elementary and secondary education; (2) improved preparation of teachers and other educational personnel; (3) construction of school buildings to facilitate district reorganization; (4) improved administration of State departments of education; (5) educational services for adults; (6) rural library services; and (7) cooperative educational research, planning, and demonstration.

The committee also recommended, among other proposals:

(1) Revision of the statutes providing Federal aid for vocational education; (2) Federal aid for students from 16 to 24 years of age, inclusive; (3) Federal appropriations for counseling through the U.S. Employment Service, and for apprentice training; (4) establishment of a permanent policy assuring educational opportunities to all children of Federal employees on reservations and at foreign posts; (5) continued functioning of the U.S. Office of Education predominantly as an agency for research and leadership in education; and (6) establishment of an interdepartmental committee to coordinate the educational activities of the various agencies of the Federal Government.

3. The National Resources Planning Board (1939)

In conformity with an act of Congress approved June 7, 1939 (53 Stat. 813), the National Resources Planning Board was established in the Executive Office of the President, effective July 1, 1939. An Executive order of September 8, 1939, authorized the Board to collect, prepare, and make available to the President, with recommendations, such plans, data, and information as might be helpful to a planned development and use of national resources, including human resources. The Board published its findings and recommendations in numerous volumes issued over a period of several years.

In accordance with instructions from the President, during 1942 and 1943 the Board concentrated its activities on correlating plans and programs under consideration in many Federal, State, and private organizations for postwar full employment, security, and building America. Part I of its report for 1943, entitled "Postwar Plan and Program," brought together some of its plans and recommendations for the period of postwar development of the Nation's expanding economy.

Respecting education the Board recommended:

(1) That equal access to elementary and high school education be assured all children and youth;

(2) That equal access to general and specialized education be made available to all youth of college and university age, according to their abilities; and

(3) That adequate funds be made available by the local and State governments and underwritten by the Federal Government to carry out these recommendations of the Board.

In developing these primary recommendations in its report, the Board set forth a number of subsidiary recommendations and supporting ideas, including, in substance, the following having special bearing upon the role of the Federal Government:

The services of the U.S. Office of Education and State departments of education should be expanded and developed to provide adequate research facilities and educational leadership to the Nation. In the future the Office of Education should become the major instrument of educational research and planning. Its services should be expanded and improved.

Most of the increases in expenditures for education in the postwar period must be financed principally, if not entirely, by Federal funds. Inequalities of the tax burden for education within and among the States should be reduced through the distribution of State and Federal funds on the basis of need. Not even an approximate approach to equality of educational opportunity can be achieved unless the great disparities in the ability to support education among and within States are materially reduced. The only agency that can remedy the inequality among the States in the tax burden for education is the Federal Government. It should accept this role.

Federal funds should be used primarily to improve educational opportunity in States where the need is greatest. Need can be determined according to the number of persons to be educated and the financial ability of the States to raise revenue.

4. The President's Commission on Higher Education (1946)

On July 13, 1946, President Truman established the President's Commission on Higher Education. He charged its members with the task of examining the functions of higher education in our democracy and determining the means by which these functions can best be performed.

The magnitude of the issues involved prompted the Commission to incorporate its findings and recommendations in a series of six volumes. Following are, in substance, some of the more significant comments and recommendations which they contain relative to the role of the Federal Government in education:

The Federal Government assumes responsibility for supplementing State and local efforts in military defense against the Nation's enemies without; surely it may as justifiably assume responsibility for supplementing State and local efforts against educational deficiencies and inequalities that are democracy's enemies within.

Existing programs and proposals indicate that the Federal Government recognizes the desirability of providing financial aid to students in higher education, because of the public benefits which accrue. This Commission believes, however, that a general program of national grants-in-aid and graduate fellowships, equally available within the limits of the Federal appropriation to all eligible students, will make specialized and piecemeal programs unnecessary and unwise. By having all general grants and fellowship programs administered within a single program, the competition among the various programs can be eliminated. This is imperative to meet total national needs.

A national program of Federal scholarships in the form of grants-in-aid should be provided for at least 20 percent of all undergraduate, nonveteran students.

The basis of individual need, coupled with requisite qualifications of total personal abilities and interests, should be the controlling factor in the selection of the recipients of such aid.

Methods of allocating funds within the several States should be on a basis which takes account of the number of each State's high school graduates and total college-age population.

The Commission recommends a fundamental change in the position given to the central education agency in the Federal Government. First, the financial support given to the U.S. Office of Education must be commensurate with the great tasks confronting that agency. Second, the status of the agency within the framework of the Government must be raised. Regardless of the manner in which this is done, the status of education in the Federal Government must be raised before the Government will be able to play its important role in the speedy improvement in education at all levels throughout the country.

The Commission recommends that the President establish an interdepartmental committee consisting of a representative or representatives of each department or agency maintaining one or more educational or research programs which utilize the colleges or universities, the U.S. Commissioner of Education to serve as chairman.

To provide the financial support for higher education which its value to the individual and to the Nation more than justifies will require that the role of the Federal Government, as a partner with the States in the support of higher education, be greatly strengthened and expanded.

The time has come for America to develop a sound pattern of continuing Federal support for higher education.

5. The (Hoover) Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, 1947

In accordance with Public Law 162 (80th Cong.) approved July 7, 1947, the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, headed by former President Herbert Hoover, undertook an examination into the operation and organization of the executive functions and activities. In this examination it had the assistance of various task forces which made studies of particular segments of the Government.

Following is a summary of some of the major criticisms and recommendations concerning the administration of Federal activities in education set forth in the Commission's "Report on Social Security and Education" and in the task force report on "Public Welfare":

The Commission's "Report on Social Security and Education."—With respect to elementary and secondary education the Federal Government has engaged in overlapping and independent promotions of curriculum in highly specialized fields, while neglecting the general curriculum needs of the country. Direct Federal aid to local schools in curriculum development and in providing school lunches has circumvented State departments of education. There has not been sufficient coordination of the educational and nutritional aspects of the school lunch program.

Federal departments and agencies are making grants or entering into contracts for research through colleges and universities without any coordination of these programs. These projects are concentrated in the natural and physical sciences and have an important effect upon the educational system.

There are those who think that these programs should be concentrated in the U.S. Office of Education, but the Commission believes they must be administered by the agencies whose functions they promote.

The task force report on "Public Welfare."—In general, Federal activities in encouragement and support of education in the States have been highly beneficial both from a State and a national point of view.

A danger to education lies in the uncontrolled spread of uncoordinated and specialized educational functions over the Government without regard to effective overall educational development.

Legislation has been piecemeal and programs have been uncoordinated. Aggressive groups or agencies have promoted their causes through education without regard to the overall development of education. Uncoordinated activities in this field pervade practically all of the major departments and independent agencies of the executive branch. During each of the last several years the Federal Government has expended several billions of dollars for educational activities carried out through other than State channels.

Basic control of and responsibility for education should continue to be a State and local function. However, the Nation, as well as States and localities, is vitally concerned that education be effective and Federal financial assistance and leadership of a noncoercive nature are often desirable. Grants-in-aid or other fiscal assistance to States for education should be as general as possible in nature, consistent with the Federal obligation and necessity for ascertaining that funds are used for the purposes for which intended.

All Federal activities concerning elementary or secondary schools in the States should be the responsibility of the Federal educational agency unless the evidence is clear cut to the contrary. The agency should also be responsible for Federal activities involving higher educational institutions which primarily concern more than the speciality of any noneducational department or independent agency.

The Federal educational agency should be a source for professional educational service to all governmental agencies involved in educational matters, whether concerned with inservice training or the promotion of their particular specialities. Needing greater stress is the function of the agency to perform aggressive research, diffuse information and promote educational activities greatly needed but often neglected by States.

The organization of the Office of Education should be consistent with what is considered good organizational practice on the State and local level. Serious consideration should be given to the establishment of a National Board of Education.

The determination of the location of the Federal educational agency in the executive branch should be governed largely by its functions and its modes of operation. The majority of the amassed evidence seems to be in favor of making the Office of Education an independent agency.

6. THE (HOOVER) COMMISSION ON ORGANIZATION OF THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH OF THE GOVERNMENT (1953)

A Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government (often called the Second Hoover Commission) was created by Public Law 108 of the 83d Congress approved by the President on July 10, 1953. The Commission consisted of four persons appointed by President Eisenhower, four persons appointed by the President of the Senate, and four persons appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. Former President Herbert Hoover was elected chairman of the Commission. Its duties were set forth in the establishing act, which gave it powers to investigate and recommend policies as well as administrative methods.

To carry out the congressional directives, task forces were enlisted from among professional men and executives. Most of the members of these task forces had had experience in executive agencies of the Federal Government. The task forces were equipped with research and clerical staffs.

Total appropriations to the Commission by the 83d and 84th Congresses amounted to $2,848,534.[2]

In the final report of the Commission dated June 1955, general dissents or reservations concerning recommendations made by the Commission were expressed by five of its members.

Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government. Final report to the Congress, June 1955, p. 4.

In a consideration of recommendations by the Commission it might be helpful to bear in mind that the stated primary purpose of the Commission was to recommend methods by which reductions could be made in the expenditures by the executive branch of the Federal Government without injury to the security or welfare of the country.

A number of statements and recommendations concerning Federal educational policies and programs appear in the Commission's reports and in the task force reports. Some of these in the Commission's reports are here identified as follows:[3]

REPORT ON FEDERAL MEDICAL SERVICES, FEBRUARY 1955 (pp. 27, 29)

Recommendation No. 2

That the medical and hospital services of the three armed services be modified into a much more closely coordinated pattern which will provide that:

* * * * * * *

(d) Each of the three military departments maintain a medical center, the components of which should be a hospital and a center for education of military medical personnel occupied with medical problems identified with the primary mission of the departments.

Recommendation No. 4

That the Secretary of Defense strengthen the armed services training program for interns and residents, for other physicians and dentists on active duty, and for Reserve officers not on active duty.

REPORT ON LEGAL SERVICES AND PROCEDURE, MARCH 1955 (pp. 28, 30)

* * * * * * *

Recommendation No. 19

There should be no program affording an undergraduate legal education to officers of the Army, Navy, or Air Force. Should the need exist, Marine Corps officers not above the rank of first lieutenant (permanent or temporary) may be so trained. Each such Marine Corps lieutenant must contractually agree to remain on active duty in the Marine Corps for not less than 5 years after completion of law training and to seek admission to the bar. If admitted, he should serve only as an officer-attorney in the Marine Corps.

* * * * * * *

Recommendation No. 20

Separate schools of military justice should be discontinued and a joint school for all four services created. The joint school of military justice should offer a curriculum of military justice and military affairs only. In addition to military attorneys, nonattorneys senior ranking officers of all services whose responsibilities require a knowledge of the Uniform Code of Military Justice should be directed to attend the school.

REPORT ON LENDING AGENCIES, MARCH 1955 (p. 42)

Recommendation No. 15

That the program of loans for college housing be terminated.

* * * * * * *

REPORT ON SURPLUS PROPERTY, APRIL (pp. 35–36, 93)

The Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, authorizes the Administrator of General Services to donate surplus property to the States, territories, and possessions for educational or public health purposes without cost (except for costs of care and handling).

* * * * * * *

---

[3] The relevant recommendations in the task force reports are concerned mainly with Federal, medical, and legal services.

Recommendation No. 23

That the Congress review, simplify, and codify the statutes relating to the transfer of real property to State agencies and institutions for public purposes, and establish uniform criteria for determining public benefits and terms and conditions governing the use of transferred property.

REPORT ON RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT, MAY 1955 (p. 50)

* * * * * * *

Commission Recommendation No. 5

That greater Federal support be given to basic and medical research.

7. THE COMMISSION ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS (1953)

In a message to Congress on March 30, 1953, President Eisenhower recommended the creation of a commission to study the means of achieving a sounder relationship between Federal, State, and local governments. Pursuant to his recommendation, an act creating the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations was passed by the Congress and approved by the President on July 10, 1953.[4] The act directed the Commission to examine the role of the Federal Government in relation to the States and their political subdivisions.

In accordance with provisions of the act, the President appointed 15 members, and the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House each appointed five members of the Commission. The House members originally appointed served throughout. Under the Senate ruling that Senators not reelected became ineligible to serve on the Commission, the President of the Senate replaced three of his original appointees. President Eisenhower first designated Clarence E. Manion as chairman; and, after his resignation, the President appointed Meyer Kestnbaum (president of Hart Schaffner & Marx) to serve as Chairman of the Commission.

An act approved February 7, 1955, directed the Commission not later than June 30, 1955, to submit to the President for transmittal to the Congress its final report, including recommendations for legislation action.

Chapter 9 of the final report of the Commission deals with "Education." Concerning the role of the Federal Government in education the report says in part:

> Most Federal activities in support of education have been incidental to other national objectives. * * *
>
> The American people can take pride in the accomplishments of State and local governments in the continued extension of educational opportunities. Financial support has on the whole been generously provided and standards have steadily risen, even in the less wealthy States. There is ample reason to regard State and local control of education as one of our most prized traditions. * * *
>
> That the primary responsibility for the support of general public education should continue to rest with the States and local units is not in dispute. But there are disagreements in determining the nature of national responsibility, and in deciding how that responsibility should be discharged.
>
> Since the early years of the Republic, our citizens have insisted upon free public education. In Madison's words, "a popular government, without popular information, or the means of acquiring it, is but a prologue to a farce or a tragedy, or perhaps both."[5] It is beside the point and completely unnecessary to justify a national interest in education solely upon considerations of national defense or

---

[4] Public Law 109, 83d Cong., first sess.

[5] Letter to W. T. Barry, in "The Writings of Madison," ed. Gaillard Hunt, New York, 1910, vol. 9, p. 104.

population mobility. Although organized as a Federal system, ours is one Nation, and there is inherent and indisputable national interest in having an educated citizenry; only in this way can national, as well as State and local, self-government be insured.

But there is nothing incompatible between the national interests in an educated citizenry and our tradition of leaving responsibility for general public education to the States. The natonal interest in education, like many other national objectives, is best served by State and local administration and control. The Commission believes that with certain exceptions, noted later, national action directly related to general public education is best confined to research, advisory, and clearinghouse functions such as those currently performed by the Office of Education.

The report of the Commission contains the following recommendations concerning education, schools, or schoolchildren:

The Commission recognizes the accomplishments of the school lunch program and recommends that States take action to expand the program to include many schools and schoolchildren presently unable to participate.

With respect to Federal assistance to State and local school lunch programs, the Commisison recommends (1) the continuation of commodity donations as long as these stocks continue to be acquired and held as surplus by the National Government; and (2) the reduction and elimination of cash grants after a reasonable period of time, with the assumption by States, localities, and parents of full responsibility for the cash financing required.[6]

* * * * * * *

The Commission recommends that legislative authorization be continued for grants for school construction and operation in federally affected areas for such times as the need exists.

* * * * * * *

The Commission recommends that legislative action be taken to limit Federal grants-in-aid in behalf of vocational education to subjects vested with a clear and special national interest, and to establish new categories of Federal grants only to stimulate forms of training especially important to the national interest. It is further recommeded that existing grants not meeting these criteria be eliminated after a reasonable period of time.[7]

The Commission recommends that responsibility for providing general public education continue to rest squarely upon the States and their political subdivisions. The Commission further recommends that the States act vigorously and promptly to discharge this responsibility. The Commission does not recommend a general program of Federal financial assistance to elementary and secondary education, believing that the States have the capacity to meet their educational requirements. However, where, upon a clear factual finding of need and lack of resources, it is demonstrated that one or more States do not have sufficient tax resources to support an adequate school system, the National Government, through some appropriate means, would be justified in assisting such States temporarily in financing the construction of school facilities—exercising particular caution to avoid interference by the National Government in educational processes or programs.[8]

A study committee report on "Federal Responsibility in the Field of Education" which was submitted to the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations and transmitted to President Eisenhower on June 20, 1955, set forth a number of principles, conclusions, and recommendations, including the following:

1. Adequate education of all American youth is essential to the preservation of the Republic and to the welfare of the Nation in peace and war. The country's most important resource lies in its citizens more than in its soil or climate or extent of territory. Full development of this resource is dependent upon solutions to a number of pressing problems. * * *

---

[6] Dissent from this recommendation was expressed by five members of the Commission.

[7] Dissent by five members of the Commission.

[8] Concurrence with the substance and spirit of this recommendation but with specific reservations, was expressed by one member of the Commission. Dissent with this recommendation was expressed by three members.

2. These problems combine to emphasize that the financial needs of education are on the rise. We believe that the American people can and will devote an increasing share of their income to education. The question is not whether the United States can afford to spend more on education than it does now, but how the needed funds can best be raised. * * *

3. Every American child has the right to an adequate educational opportunity. That opportunity can be provided by local communities and States more satisfactorily and equitably than by the Federal Government. School boards, in cooperation with State legislatures, are in a better position to determine the adequacy of their schools than Congress or any other agency of the Federal Government.

* * * * * * *

8. The general conclusion is that Federal aid is not necessary either for current operating expenses for public schools or for capital expenditures for new school facilities. Local communities and States are able to supply both in accordance with the will of their citizens.

* * * * * * *

10. * * * The teaching of vocational knowledge and skills is an essential part of the general education in our schools. The vocational education program should be strengthened as an integral part of the high school program.

Vocational education, as all education, is a primary responsibility of States and local governments. There is a continuing interest of the Federal Government in vocational education where a clear national interest is involved.

In the activities which do not specifically contribute to training for defense there should be a tapering off of Federal grants. State and local governments can and should provide from their own funds an adequate vocational program.

In programs where a clear national interest is involved there should be a continuing Federal participation in their financing, so that there will be a hard core of Federal responsibility left which could be expanded in times of emergency. Many of the detailed specifications and minute controls of the existing grant-in-aid programs should be eliminated.

11. * * * There is a clear obligation of the Federal Government to make payments toward the construction and operation of schools in areas where Federal activities have led to an influx of children and thereby imposed a special burden upon communities.

Wherever possible the responsibility should be returned to localties as a more adequate tax base is developed.

There will be cases where the Federal Government will have to carry the responsibility permanently because of the particular nature of the situation.

12. * * * The public library is an important community service, and essential part of overall public education, particularly of adult self-education.

* * * * * * *

13. The principles which we have outlined earlier in this statement apply at all levels of education, elementary, secondary, and higher.

The question whether Federal aid should be extended in the field of higher education involves considerations so complex that they cannot adequately be disposed of by this committee in the time available to us. * * *

8. The White House Conference on Education (1955)

In his state of the Union message to the 83d Congress, second session, on January 7, 1954, President Eisenhower expressed the hope that a conference on education would be held in each State, culminating in a White House Conference on Education.

Subsequently, through passage of Public Law 530, the Congress authorized an appropriation of $700,000 to be distributed among the States and territories to defray the costs of these statewide meetings of educators and lay citizens to discuss their school needs.

A special Committee for the White House Conference on Education, appointed by the President, met in Washington on December 2, 1954, to begin its work of carrying out the President's plans for an unprecedented citizen study of educational needs and problems. Neil

H. McElroy, president of Procter & Gamble Co., was the appointed Chairman of the Committee.

Within 4 months after the President's Committee held its first meeting, the Governors of all the States and territories had agreed to cooperate in the conference program. Federal funds were allocated to the States and territories on the basis of population, with a minimum of $5,000. In return for this money, each State and territory was obligated to furnish a report on its conference program.

The White House Conference on Education was held in Washington, D.C., November 28 through December 1, 1955. By decision of the President's Committee, the Conference restricted itself to discussion of problems affecting the elementary and secondary schools, public and nonpublic. The President's Committee presented topics for discussion by the Conference.

(a) REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT'S COMMITTEE FOR THE WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON EDUCATION

The report of the President's Committee, dated April 1956, was based upon its own studies into the topics discussed at the White House Conference, the results of the White House Conference, and the results of the State and territorial conferences. The report contains numerous comments and recommendations involving consideration of the Federal role in education, including the following having specific reference to the Federal Government:

> * * * In the opinion of this Committee, money for schools must continue to come from all three levels of government, with a portion of funds for school buildings being made available by the Federal Government on an emergency basis. * * *
>
> Since the collection and dissemination of educational statistics is a primary function of the U.S. Office of Education, it is urgently recommended that the statistical services of the Office be expanded. For the performance of this service, the cooperation of all State departments of education is essential.
>
> The other research services of the Office of Education should be expanded.
>
> The Federal Government should deal with local school systems only through the responsible State school agency, usually the State department of education. Such a plan of operation is a necessary safeguard against Federal control of education.
>
> Federal funds for the elementary and secondary schools should be channeled through the U.S. Office of Education.
>
> Research should be conducted at local, State, and Federal levels on the problems posed by big city school systems. As much attention should be paid the need for decentralization in urban areas as to the need for consolidation in rural areas (p. 22).
>
> * * * The U.S. Office of Education, State departments of education, and the professional associations of teachers, as well as colleges and universities and groups of interested citizens, should provide attractive materials and conduct active campaigns to interest students in teaching * * *(p. 46).
>
> * * * Sufficient funds should be provided for the U.S. Office of Education, and that agency should assume primary responsibility (a) in conducting research directly; (b) in contracting with agencies, professional organizations, and others qualified to do effective research; and (c) in stimulating, encouraging, and coordinating a continuous program of study at all levels of government * * * (p. 49).
>
> * * * * * * *
>
> This committee recommends that the Federal Government provide school building aid to the States and territories on a short-time emergency basis * * * (p. 59).

(b) REPORT OF THE WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON EDUCATION

The following conclusions are among those relating to the role of the Federal Government in education that appear in the report of the White House Conference on Education, dated April 1956:

> The people of the United States have inherited a commitment, and have the responsibility to provide for all a full opportunity for a free public education regardless of physical, intellectual, social, or emotional differences, or of race, creed, or religion (p. 91).
>
> * * * * * * *
>
> The Federal Government should have no control whatsoever over school building plans and specifications.
>
> Some thought, however, that the U.S. Office of Education should engage in research in all areas of school building materials and construction and make results available to schools.
>
> Some thought that wherever the Federal Government allocates money to impacted areas, any regulation should be exercised through existing State agences if such exist in the States (p. 97).
>
> * * * * * * *
>
> The participants approved by a ratio of more than 2 to 1 the proposition that the Federal Government should increase its financial participation in public education. Of those favoring such increase, the overwhelming majority approved an increase in Federal funds for school building construction. On the issue of Federal funds to the States for local school operation, the participants divided almost evenly. A very small minority was opposed to Federal aid for education in any form.
>
> A majority agreed that all States and territories and the District of Columbia should be eligible for Federal funds but that they should be granted only on the basis of demonstrated needs.
>
> Federal aid should never be permitted to become a deterrent to State and local initiative in education.
>
> The administration of Federal funds should be through the appropriate State agency for education. This State agency should determine the relative needs of local school districts. There was some opinion that Federal administration of financial grants for education should be vested in the U.S. Office of Education.
>
> The delegates almost unanimously opposed any Federal control over educational use of funds in local school districts. Accounting by the States to the Federal Government for fiscal purposes was not interpreted as Federal control of education.
>
> One table in 10 recommended that Federal aid should be made available to States only for those districts certifying that they are conforming to the Supreme Court decision prohibiting racially segregated school systems (p. 103).

(C) REPORTS OF STATE AND TERRITORIAL CONFERENCES ON EDUCATION

Each of the 53 States and territories invited to participate in the 1955 White House Conference on Education conducted a conference program in preparation for the national conference. The following statements appear in the Presidential Committee's summary of conclusions and recommendations contained in the State and territorial reports:

> * * * Several reports recommend that the U.S. Office of Education be given Cabinet status or be made an independent agency, or in any event should be strengthened in the services it now performs (p. 116).
>
> In brief, the reports stress the fact that worthy young people cannot be encouraged to prepare for teaching when the material rewards are inadequate, when the teacher-training institutions are not high in quality, and when the working conditions are unattractive. Of particular importance is the need for scholarships. Communities, civic organizations, and State and Federal Govern-

ments are urged to take immediate steps to develop scholarship programs * * * (p. 119).

* * * * * * *

First, no State expresses opposition to all types of Federal aid. That is, every State seems to want Federal aid for one or more of the following purposes: vocational education, school lunches, school buildings, general Federal aid, and in federally impacted areas.

Twenty-three States report in favor of Federal aid for school building construction. Of these, six States specifically mention that the aid should be based on needs, effort, and the ability to pay. Three of the States want the aid to be distributed on a matching basis, and another indicates that the aid must be based on an objective formula.

Fifteen States approve the principle of Federal aid or Federal aid for general purposes * * * (p. 121).

9. The President's Committee on Education Beyond the High School (1956)

In a special message to Congress concerning "our educational system" on January 12, 1956, President Eisenhower expressed his intention to appoint a Committee on Education Beyond the High School. He said that the purpose of the Committee would be "to lay before us" all the problems of education beyond the high school and to encourage systematic attack upon them. On April 19, 1956, the White House announced the appointment of 33 persons to constitute the Committee. Devereux C. Josephs, chairman of the board, New York Life Insurance Co., became Chairman of the Committee.

Preliminary operations of the Committee began in April 1956, with available Presidential discretionary funds. These were supplemented by congressional appropriations. A total of $250,000 was made available to the Committee for its work over a period of approximately 2 years.

A bill to establish a statutory basis for the work of the Committee was introduced by Representative Carl Elliott, of Alabama, and, having passed both Houses of Congress, was approved by the President on July 26, 1956. In the preamble of the law the Congress declared it to be—

imperative that immediate stimulus be given to planning and action throughout the Nation which will meet adequately the needs for education beyond the high school.

* * * * * * *

Chapter V of the final report of the Committee, dated July 1957, deals with "The Federal Government and Education Beyond the High School." The chapter ends with a number of "conclusions and recommendations," reading in part as follows:

1. The Federal Government should provide broad national leadership, should collect and provide useful data and services, and should provide certain other needed assistance, such as is recommended in this report. But it should do these things only by methods which strengthen State and local effort and responsibility and, in the case of direct financial assistance, only through programs which are periodically reviewed and which are promptly terminated when no longer clearly justifiable. Finally, the Federal Government should studiously avoid programs and policies which carry the threat either of control or of other adverse effects upon the educational institutions.

> 2. It is obvious to us who have served on this Committee that there is a most inadequate body of facts upon which plans within or without the Federal Government can be based, and no central responsibility. Post-high school education is local in fact and national in its consequences. In this respect it does not differ from agriculture or commerce and industry. The farmers and the businessmen are much better served by their Government, nor would they tolerate the deficiencies of facts and of assistance in planning that are experienced by the educational community—which includes all citizens: educators, students, parents, and employers.
>
> 3. Noticeable and important effects on institutions can be found resulting from practically every one of the Federal programs discussed in this chapter. By no means all effects are adverse, but the programs need thorough study in the light of their total impact and individual continuing importance.
>
> 4. The interests of both the Federal Government and the educational institutions require a much higher degree of continuing interagency coordination in Federal activities which have an impact on post-high school education than exist among the large number of Federal agencies involved at the present time.
>
> 5. There should be more effective means for reflecting the views of educational institutions and associations, States and lay citizens in policy determining and program planning for activities at the Federal level which relate to post-high school education.
>
> * * * * * * *
>
> 10. The Committee, therefore, urgently recommends that the President authorize and direct the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to develop for his consideration specific proposals on the best means for setting up whatever machinery may be necessary (*a*) to further a continuous and orderly review and development of the national and intragovernmental aspects of education beyond the high school, and (*b*) to fulfill the other needs relating thereto which are identified in these conclusions and recommendations.
>
> 11. The Committee further recommends that the following functions of the U.S. Office of Education be particularly reviewed and where necessary strengthened to enable that Office: (1) As a matter of highest priority to increase substantially the effectiveness of its factfinding and reporting services, using the most advanced techniques already in use in other fields of national interest, with the aim of supplying the Nation with a continuing flow of reliable and up-to-date information about conditions and trends in education beyond the high school; (2) to provide more technical and professional staff services to assist States, communities, and institutions, at their request, in planning for education beyond the high school; and (3) to encourage more widespread experimentation in institutional management and teacher effectiveness (pp. 106–108).

10. Other Governmental Advisory Groups Before 1960

Besides the commissions already named, prior to 1960 the Federal Government sponsored several other committees and conferences which published criticisms and recommendations concerning the administration of Federal activities in education. Included are the following groups which will be here identified and their criticisms and recommendations briefly noted: (1) the White House Conference on Children in a Democracy (1939); (2) the Committee on Planning for Education (1941); (3) the Committee on Intergovernmental Fiscal Relations (1943); (4) the Midcentury White House Conference on Children and Youth (1950); and (5) the President's Committee on Scientists and Engineers (1958).

The White House Conference on Children in a Democracy was organized at the suggestion of President F. D. Roosevelt and convened in April 1939 and January 1940. The Conference, headed by Francis Perkins, Secretary of Labor, ultimately comprised 676 people. These represented many types of professional and civic interests, practical experience, and political and religious belief.

The general report adopted by the Conference in January 1940 declared that the resources of many school districts and even of entire States and regions cannot keep pace with the needs of the school population nor provide suitable standards of educational efficiency. The Conference recommended that an extended program of Federal financial assistance to the States be adopted in order to reduce inequalities in educational opportunity among States.

In December 1941, the U.S. Commissioner of Education appointed a Committee on Planning for Education, which in 1942 published a report embodying its discussions and viewpoints. The report contains the following statement relative to the role of the Federal Government in education:

> The financial support of public education must be borne jointly by the Federal, State, and local governments. In general the Federal and State Governments have never assumed a sufficiently large share of the costs of public education. * * *

In June 1941, the Secretary of the Treasury appointed a Committee on Intergovernmental Fiscal Relations to make a comprehensive study of the fiscal relations of the Federal, State, and local governments. The project was financed in part by special funds provided by the Congress. The Committee also had at its disposal the aid of the Institute of Public Administration, made possible by a grant to the institute by the Carnegie Corp. to carry through such parts of the work as could not appropriately be financed from Federal funds.

The report of the Committee was published in 1943 as a congressional document.[9] It reviewed some of the factors which should be considered in connection with proposals for Federal participation in financing general elementary and secondary education. With reference to the use of Federal funds in the maintenance of minimum standards of educational opportunity the Committee declared that:

> Of all the functions of Government which might be candidates for minimum status, general education has the strongest claim.

Concerning other Federal activities in education the Committee advanced the following ideas:

> In the field of secondary and higher education a conspicuous fact is the amount of latent talent in the population which is never developed. Many of the most promising youths discontinue education long before the opportunities for profitable investment, both from the personal and social points of view, have been exhausted. Better exploitation of talent would help to increase the national income and to diminish differences in its distribution.
>
> As to higher education, the program had best be confined to aid to individuals rather than institutions. This might take the form of federally supported scholarships of various sorts, including loan scholarships and work scholarships on the order of those offered by the National Youth Administration. Scholarship loans to be repaid through the return of a percentage of the beneficiary's income (like a special income tax) over a certain period of time on the postschool period might also be considered. The amount granted on these conditions should be generous, but the selection should follow rigorous standards of fitness.

* * * * * * *

The Midcentury White House Conference on Children and Youth was called by President Truman in August 1949. At that time the President appointed a committee of 52 prominent citizens to direct the planning and subsequent activities. The Conference was held in Washington, D.C., December 3 to 7, 1950. Over 6,000 persons, including 4,620 voting delegates, attended. All the States and Territories were represented.

---

[9] 78th Cong., first sess., S. Doc. 69.

By a vote of its delegates in plenary session on December 7, 1950, the Conference adopted a platform statement which had been developed in the various discussions based upon numerous studies and reports. The platform contains many recommendations concerning education, including the following having particular reference to the role of the Federal Government:

> 10. That steps be taken at the national, State, and local levels to improve the facilities and increase the output of professional schools preparing persons for services to children.
>
> * * * * * * *
>
> 17. That further Federal aid be provided to the States for educational services, in tax-supported public schools, without Federal control, to help equalize educational opportunity; the issue of auxiliary services to be considered on its merits in separate legislation.

On April 4, 1956, the White House announced appointment of the National Committee for the Development of Scientists and Engineers, upon the recommendation of the Special Interdepartmental Committee on the Development of Scientists and Engineers. President Eisenhower assigned the Committee the task of "increasing the supply and improving the quality of our technological personnel." The name of the Committee was later changed to the President's Committee on Scientists and Engineers.

The Committee's final report to the President dated December 17, 1958, contains several recommendations concerning the role of the Federal Government in the education of manpower. In this report the Committee strongly recommended that:

> The Federal Government at the White House level assume the responsibility for coordinating and stimulating the Nation's efforts in the development and utilization of highly trained manpower (p. i).

The Committee stated that this responsibility should cover the three following broad areas:

> The coordination and development of Federal policies with regard to highly trained manpower and the coordination of the many Federal programs which affect the education and utilization of this manpower.
>
> The coordination of governmental and private efforts abroad further to develop and better to utilize the pool of highly trained manpower available to us and the friendly nations so as to promote the most effective arrangements for maximum utilization of these resources.
>
> The continued close Government liaison and cooperation with the great private agencies of our country which educate or utilize this manpower (p. 1).

Other recommendations by the Committee included the proposal that:

> Efforts be intensified to stimulate the formation of citizen groups at local, State, and regional levels to improve mathematics and science teaching in our primary and secondary schools and to interest more of our able youth in these courses (p. iv).

11. The White House Conference on Aging (1961)

On January 8, 1958, Representative John Fogarty, of Rhode Island, introduced a bill which about 8 months later became the White House Conference on Aging Act. The act invited each State to collect facts about its older population, inventory its resources and facilities, and locate and identify through analysis of the facts where services to the elderly were adequate and where there were gaps. The act also invited each State to develop recommendations for new approaches and programs—which would provide a basis for discussion at a White House Conference. Federal grants were made available to the States to assist them in organizing their activities as part of the Federal policy of working jointly with States and their citizens toward a common goal.

Pursuant to other provisions of the act, about 2,500 delegates to the White House Conference on Aging met in Washington, D.C., on January 9, 1961. One of the reports from the Conference, entitled "Education for Aging" was made public in April 1961. The report contained a statement of recommendations reading in part as follows:

* * * * * * *

> The conservation, development, and utilization of the abilities and skills of older people have become a matter of national concern. The public interest requires that Federal legislation be enacted which will empower the U.S. Office of Education to cooperate with States, communities, public and private schools, institutions of higher education, and public and private libraries to stimulate the development and operation of educational programs about, for, and by the aging.
>
> The initial stimulation of education programs for, about, and by the aging should be through institutions that have public responsibility for education, that in combination, have nationwide coverage and that have the confidence of all groups. These institutions are public schools, institutions of higher learning, and libraries. In some cases the only complete nationwide coverage will be a Federal agency. * * * Universities and colleges are among the best equipped organizations to carry on the research needed in the aging process and in the needs and interests of the aging, and to conduct studies relevant to the total community effort in education for the aging. Public and private schools have the opportunity to develop, through a strong program of adult education, education for the aging in all of its aspects. Public and private libraries can provide both the materials, information, and references services on aging for all interested agencies and segments of the population, and appropriate facilities, services, and programs for the aging and those who work with the aging.
>
> All of these National, State, and local agencies working together can develop a program of education that will cover the Nation with an initial program of education and counseling to be augmented by other agencies such as churches, labor organizations, industry, major voluntary organizations, organizations of older people, and other private and public community organizations and agencies, which even now are doing outstanding work in the field of aging in some localities scattered throughout the country. The situation demands that such a program be stimulated on a nationwide basis. This can be done best initially by organized Federal and State agencies, and through public and private schools, universities, and libraries with [illegible] funds to promote and develop leadership in communities in all States in al[illegible]ons of the country.
>
> Legislation should empower and direct the Office of Education to cooperate with State departments of education, institutions of higher education, and libraries, in developing active programs for the identification and development of potential leaders for education of the aging in public and private schools, in junior and senior colleges, libraries, senior citizen groups, unions industrial organizations, and all other agencies concerned with education of the aging. It should be the duty and obligation of all cooperating agencies to promote and operate broad and diversified education programs for older people. These programs should include: Health education; education to enrich the outlook and interests of senior citizens; occupational education; education to increase knowledge and understanding of the aging process; and education and other related services designed to help older people to discover and develop their capabilities and to enhance the value of their potential contribution to society.
>
> Opportunities for continuation or reentrance into formal education should be expanded. The State should provide adequate funds to carry out the program

on the local as well as the State level. The Federal Government should participate, not only in providing leadership development but also in providing funds on a matching basis. The adult education section of the U.S. Office of Education should be strengthened and enlarged, so that leadership and assistance can be provided to the States in the development of a coordinated educational program for older adults. * * *

12. The Kennedy Task Force Committee on Education, 1961

On January 6, 1961, a Task Force Committee on Education chosen by President-elect John F. Kennedy submitted to him a report which was later made public. The report recommended for consideration by the President three major legislative proposals and four administrative actions.

There follows a brief summary of the legislative proposal respecting Federal support for the Nation's public school systems:[10]

I. FEDERAL SUPPORT FOR THE PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM

The national interest demands a first-rate system of schools and that every child have full opportunity to benefit from that system. Present standards and facilities must be improved. Millions of children, particularly in certain rural areas and in the great cities, are deprived of an opportunity to develop talents that are needed both for society and for their own lives. The Task Force Committee concludes that first priority should be given to a vigorous program to lift the schools to a new level of excellence.

State and local governments alone cannot provide the funds needed. Federal support is required. The Task Force Committee recommends that action be taken in three closely related areas: a general program of support for all public schools to reach the new level; a special program for States in economic distress in providing for schools; and a special program for city schools.

(1) The Task Force Committee recommends that the President support legislation to provide $30 per annum per pupil, based on average daily attendance in their public schools. The boards of education should be authorized to use the funds for construction, salaries, or other purposes related to the improvement of education. The program should require State and local governments to maintain or increase their support of education. The annual costs is estimated at $1.2 billion.

(2) The Task Force Committee recommends that the President support legislation designed to provide $20 per child for States with personal income per student in average daily attendance in public schools that is below 70 percent of the national average. The legislation should include provision to assure maintenance of State and local effort, and funds should be available for construction, salaries, or other purposes related to the improvement of education in the public schools, as the State may determine. It is estimated that roughly one-quarter of the States might benefit from this legislation (mostly in the South), that approximately 7 million children would be helped toward full educational opportunity, and that the annual cost would be $140 million.

(3) The Task Force Committee recommends that the President support legislation designed to provide an amount equivalent to $20 per child in average daily attendance in the public schools of the great cities (over 300,000 population) which are facing unique and grave educational problems. The legislation should authorize the U.S. Commissioner of Education to make grants to such cities based upon plans proposed by their boards of education or by boards together with other boards of education within their area, for support of research and experimental programs in the special problems of these urban schools, for the planning and construction of facilities, for the acquisition of land sites, for the improvement of programs of community service by the schools, and for the strengthening of guidance and job placement programs for pupils over 16 years of age. Eligibility for

---

[10] Report on Education submitted to President-elect Kennedy by a task force committee on education. Committee print of the Committee on Education and Labor, U.S. House of Representatives, January 1961, pp. 1–2.

> such grants should be based on a formula which includes density of population, nature of housing, and percent of students finishing high school. Provisions to assure maintenance of local effort should be included, as well as coordination with Federal and local housing agencies. It is estimated that the education of approximately 6 million children can be improved at a cost of $120 million annually.

Other legislative proposals by the task force related to (1) a Federal support program for housing and academic facilities for the colleges and universities, and (2) strengthening of the National Defense Education Act. Pursuant to later recommendations by President Kennedy these proposals were essentially put into effect by legislation.

13. PANEL OF CONSULTANTS ON EDUCATIONAL EDUCATION, 1962

In his message to Congress on American education, February 20, 1961, President John F. Kennedy announced:

> * * * I am requesting the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to convene an advisory body drawn from the educational profession, labor, industry, and agriculture, as well as the lay public, together with representatives from the Departments of Agriculture and Labor, to be charged with the responsibility of reviewing and evaluating the current National Vocational Educational Acts, and making recommendations for improving and redirecting the program.

On October 5, 1961, the White House announced that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare had appointed the Panel of Consultants on Vocational Education.

The Panel began work with its staff in Washington, D.C., on November 9–11, 1961. Subsequently the Panel met on March 7–10, May 3–5, July 14–16, September 15–18, October 6–7, October 27–28, and concluded its review at a final meeting, November 26–27, 1962.

Following are excerpts from the summary of the report of the Panel.

> The Panel believes that the Federal Government must continue to work with States and local communities to develop and improve the skills of its citizens. In place of the occupational categories specified in the present statutes, the Panel recommends that the local-State-Federal partnership increase support of vocational and technical education for—
>
> I. High school students preparing to enter the labor market or become homemakers.
> II. Youth with special needs who have academic, socioeconomic, or other handicaps that prevent them from succeeding in the usual high school vocational education program.
> III. Youth and adults who have completed or left high school and are full-time students preparing to enter the labor market.
> IV. Youth and adults unemployed or at work who need training or retraining to achieve employment stability.
> V. Adequate services and facilities to assure quality in all vocational and technical education programs.
>
> The Panel urges that occupational preparations be available to all American youth. The world of work requires many more young people well trained to enter employment in agriculture, the skilled trades, business, industry, merchandising, service occupations, and technical and health fields, as well as homemaking. Since the American population is highly mobile, responsibility for occupational preparation must be considered by every high school, but the need for vocational and technical education is especially evident in urban centers, which offer the greatest number of employment opportunities. * * *[11]

---

[11] U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Education for a Changing World of Work. Report of the Panel of Consultants on Vocational Education. Washington, Government Printing Office, 1963, pp. XVIII, XX.

14. Advisory Panel on Educational Statistics, 1963

In July 1962 the U.S. Commissioner of Education, Sterling M. McMurrin, appointed an Advisory Panel on Educational Statistics, external to the U.S. Office of Education. Considering that the Office should make a major advance in its statistical service to education, the Commissioner asked the Panel to "examine the Office of Education's statistical program and policies in relation to a number of new concepts, techniques, and emphases; and to make such recommendations as the Panel sees fit."

Under the chairman of A. Meredith Wilson, president of the University of Minnesota, the Panel met on November 13 and 14, December 17 and 18, 1962 and February 3 and 4, 1963 to consider the statistical work of the Office of Education in relation to national, State and local needs for educational statistics. In late December 1963, the report of the Panel was submitted to the newly appointed Commissioner of Education, Francis Keppel.

Among its other basic recommendations the Panel proposed the following:

> (1) *A program for training educational statisticians.*—The Office should undertake a strong program for the supplementary training of its own staff and for the recruitment and training of educational statisticians. Internships, summer institutes, short courses as well as university training centers, and fellowships should be included in this program.
>
> (2) *A continuing advisory committee.*—A continuing external committee should be established to advise the deputy for statistical research and development concerning the educational statistics program. This committee should probably consist of six members, each serving 3 years on a rotating basis, meeting at regular intervals. * * *[12]

15. The White House Conference on Education, 1965

The 1965 White House Conference on Education was called by President Lyndon B. Johnson. It was held at the White House and at the Statler Hilton Hotel in Washington on July 20 and 21, 1965. The objective of the conference was to bring together approximately 500 American citizens, from the ranks of the professional educators, Government, and the American public, to ponder and discuss the problems and promise of American education.

In his message to the Conference, Chairman John W. Gardner said:

> No specific recommendations or legislative proposals are expected to be adopted by the Conference as a body. Instead, we hope that vigorous discussion of the issues will foster enlightened action by all those responsible for shaping the future of American education.

The Conference was divided into 18 panel discussions of various topics, but the Federal role in education was not one of the discussion topics. However, consideration of the Federal role entered into the discussion of "Partnership in Education: The Role of the States." Following are relevant excerpts from the summaries of the morning and afternoon panel discussions of the subject on July 20, 1965.

Morning discussion

> A panel of State Governors and leading educators agreed with Utah Governor Calvin L. Rampton that there is little fear of "purse strings becoming puppet

---

[12] U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, Report of the Advisory Panel on Educational Statistics. PE20061, Circular 737. December 1963, p. 3.

strings" in regard to the Federal Government's partnership with the States in advancing American education. The group discussion was held at the start of the 2-day White House Conference on Education in Washington today.

Gov. John H. Reed of Maine summarized the general feeling. "I'm delighted to see the Federal Government take an increased role in education but the States should remain prime movers," he said. Governors Edmund G. (Pat) Brown of California, Richard J. Hughes of New Jersey, and former Governor Terry Sanford of North Carolina were in agreement.

* * * * * * *

Both Dr. Conant (president emeritus of Harvard University) and Governor Brown were highly enthusiastic in endorsing the "Heller plan." "The greatest step forward in education that I could imagine," was Governor Brown's opinion of the plan.

Walter Heller, former Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, initiated the idea of a tax-sharing plan to offset the "fiscal drag" on the States that arises from Federal income taxes. The Heller plan would provide that a certain percentage of Federal income tax revenues would be set aside each year for State distribution. These funds would be transferred from the Federal Government to State governments and spent by the States. The tax-sharing plan would also help the poor States somewhat more than the richer ones. A portion of the funds would be used only by the poorer States.[13]

Afternoon discussion

Fear by States that the role of the Federal Government in a State-Federal partnership would work to the disadvantage of the States—especially the poorer States—is a major deterrent to establishing workable partnership arrangements in the use of Federal funds for education in the States, according to opinions expressed at the panel meetings on "Partnership in Education" at the White House Conference on Education.

Basically the discussion dealt with the difficulty in establishing standards and directions for the administration by the States of Federal funds in education. It was that educators and legislators in several States share a fear that accepting Federal money means control by puppet-string as well as purse string.

* * * * * * *

Audience discussion brought out several points, one of which was that a Federal-State partnership requires the States to come up with a new coalition of citizens, Governors, businessmen, educators and fiscal experts to work out the standards necessary to efficiently use Federal funds and still keep encroachment in local school systems from becoming necessary.[14]

16. THE WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE "TO FULFILL THESE RIGHTS," 1966

At Howard University in Washington, D.C., on June 4, 1965, President Lyndon B. Johnson announced his plan to convene a White House Conference "To Fulfill These Rights." In February 1966, the President appointed a 30-member council to set the policies and oversee the detailed planning for the White House Conference. Following is an excerpt from the summary of the Council's report and recommendations to the Conference concerning education.

In summary, education has failed to meet the challenge of rapid technological, social and population change, and by reason of this failure has gravely aggravated the disadvantaged position of the Negro. Until the educational system is strengthened to provide every child with basic, saleable, and citizenship skills, as well as a relevant personal experience of the open society, the Negro cannot take this rightful place in American life.

Thus, as this paper has made clear, in broad terms our goals must be to:

1. Guarantee to every child equal access to the best that our socity knows how to provide, by raising the investment of human and financial resources in every school to higher standards.

---

[13] White House Conference on Education, 1965. Partnership in Education: The Role of the States. Session 3A, July 20, 1965, 11:30 a.m. Reporter: Anastasi. 2 p. processed.

[14] Ibidem, 12:30 p.m. Reporter: Pritchard. 2 p. processed.

> 2. Redress the racial imbalances in our schools and cities by deliberate color-conscious manipulation, confronting the difficult issue posed by increasing segregation in many parts of the country.
>
> 3. Strengthen the educational content and techniques of our schools, from preschool through higher education, by bringing all our research and experience to bear on new measures to produce healthy, independent, and creative citizens.
>
> To achieve these goals we must be willing to accept their interrelationship The only truly viable solutions will arise from communities which treat the issues as a whole, and devise connecting and continuous plans to carry them toward the goals simultaneously—in short, "workable programs."
>
> State administrative and financial reforms are crucial. Federal sanctions against unconstitutional and inhumane conditions, Federal investment, and experimental leadership are equally vital. But the heart of educational change, as with its social and economic framework, lies in the commitment of each community to higher goals. * * *[15]

The Conference was held on June 1 and 2, 1966. It was described by the honorary chairman, Mr. A. Philip Randolph, as "one of the most important held to seek a solution to the Negro problem since the Civil War." Following is an excerpt from the summary of the Conference discussions concerning education:

> The dominant view of the conferees was that State and local failures in education have been so prevalent that solutions must be found in increasing use of national authority, both in terms of finance and in the enforcement of policies of equality.
>
> *As long as we approach this problem on the basis of Federal supplementation, Federal bailing out, or Federal arm twisting on locally run educational patterns, we will be pursuing this issue at a conference a decade from now.*
>
> Many conferees were enthusiastic in their support of the Council's recommendation that the President issue a strong call for more leadership on the part of State and local officials in providing "*equality as a fact and equality as a result.*" They felt that such an overt identification of national responsibility and aims in education would make their local goals more attainable.
>
> Some advocated the further step of establishing national standards of per pupil expenditure, and asked for a Federal pronouncement, with a timetable and priorities firmly set, on the suggested goal of $1,000 per pupil. Also proposed were national minimum standards in curriculum, teacher training, laboratories, and building facilities—in short, a national accreditation system, to which all local systems could aspire. Some suggested that Federal grants be conditioned on evidence that districts were striving to meet such national standards.
>
> Others felt that progress could be made within the existing bounds of State control, using Federal funds as leverage and incentive. And some felt that the Federal bureaucracy would not be any more reliable than local and State bureaucracies; citizens should depend instead on political action to improve their local situation. * * *[16]

17. The Committee To Review Relationships Between Federal Agencies and Private Organizations, 1967

On February 15, 1967, President Lyndon B. Johnson appointed a committee to review the relationships between Federal agencies, particularly the Central Intelligence Agency, and American educational and private voluntary organizations.

In its report to the President dated March 29, 1967, the Committee, for reasons stated at length, recommended the following policy for the Federal Government:

> No Federal agency shall provide any covert financial assistance or support, direct or indirect, to any of the Nation's educational or private voluntary or-

---

[15] White House Conference "To Fulfill These Rights." Council's report and recommendations to the Conference. Washington, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1966, pp. 49–50.

[16] The Report of the White House Conference, "To Fulfill These Rights," Washington, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1966, pp. 79–80.

ganizations. This policy specifically applies to all foreign activities of such organizations and it reaffirms present policy with respect to their domestic activities.

Where such support has been given, it will be terminated as quickly as possible without destroying valuable private organizations before they can seek new means of support. * * *[17]

In its report the Committee said further, in part:

It is of the greatest importance to our future and to the future of free institutions everywhere that other nations, especially their young people, know and understand American viewpoints. There is no better way to meet this need than through the activity of private American organizations.

The time has surely come for the Government to help support such activity in a mature, open manner.

Some progress toward that aim already has been made. In recent years, a number of Federal agencies have developed contracts, grants, and other forms of open assistance to private organizations for overseas activities. This assistance, however, does not deal with a major aspect of the problem. A number of organizations cannot, without hampering their effectiveness as independent bodies, accept funds directly from Government agencies.

The Committee therefore recommends that the Government should promptly develop and establish a public-private mechanism to provide public funds openly for overseas activities of organizations which are adjudged deserving, in the national interest, of public support.[18]

B. NONGOVERNMENTAL ADVISORY GROUPS

In addition to the governmental advisory commissions named in the preceding section of this report, within recent years various advisory groups affiliated with national, nongovernmental organizations interested in education have published criticisms and made recommendations concerning the administration of Federal activities in education. Like the governmental commissions, these nongovernmental bodies have usually arrived at their conclusions following extensive study and deliberations, altogether representing enormous investments of time and money.

Identification of certain groups of this type and some of their presently significant criticisms and recommendations concerning Federal activities in education appear in the following pages. While the comments of these groups relate largely to Federal aid to the States for education, this sometimes involves the whole role of the Federal Government in education, and some of the findings and recommendations deal specifically with the latter, broader field of activity.

Many of these recommendations of these groups are remarkably applicable to the role of the Federal Government in education today.

Recommendations only by former ad hoc commissions are here considered. Position statements and recommendations by presently active commissions are included in chapter 7 of this report.

1. The National Conference on the Financing of Education (1933)

The National Conference on the Financing of Education was held in 1933 under the auspices of the Joint Commission on the Emergency in Education and the Department of Superintendence of the National Education Association. Participants represented a number of educational organizations and agencies. The report of the Conference set forth—

---

[17] Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents, Apr. 3, 1967, p. 557.

[18] Ibidem, pp. 557–558.

> from a vast amount of research and experience, the essentials of a modern school finance program.

The program included a continuing policy for the Federal financing of public education having as its components the following ideas: (1) Federal support for education is in accord with the development of national policy with respect to education; (2) the need for Federal aid to the States, apparent from the beginning, has been increased by the development of the machine and power age; (3) the Federal Government should enable the States to support a foundation program of education for all children within the Nation.

The Conference advocated recognition of the principle that no locality should be required to burden itself more than any other in order to provide a foundation program of education and pointed out that:

> * * * just as there are inequalities in ability to support schools within a State, so there is variation in ability to support schools among the States themselves. Children suffer the denial of educational opportunity because of these inequalities. This situation can be remedied only when a larger proportion of the school revenue comes from the Nation as a whole.

In advocating Federal aid to provide a foundation program of education for all children, the Conference declared that the strength of the Nation is dependent upon the educational opportunity provided for all the children of all the people, and stated further:

> The lack of provision for education in any area cannot but result in limiting the possible development of the social, economic, and cultural life of the whole people. The children living in the several States will rule not only in the localities and in the States in which they live, but will determine as well the policies which are to control and the Government which is to prevail throughout the Nation. The preservation and development of our society as well as simple equity demand that the Nation assume a larger responsibility in the support of the public school system.

2. THE AMERICAN YOUTH COMMISSION (1940)

In 1935 the American Council on Education called attention to the need for a nationwide study of the problems of American youth. Subsequently the Council formed the American Youth Commission to (1) consider the needs of youth and appraise the resources for meeting these needs, (2) plan programs to help solve the problems of youth, and (3) promote desirable plans of action.

In 1940 the Commission recommended rapid expansion of Federal aid to the States for educational purposes. In this connection the Commission drew attention to the marked inequality in tax resources among the several States and declared that—

> Equalization of educational opportunity should be regarded realistically, not as charity from wealthy cities and States to their poorer brethren, but as a necessary provision for national security. The children born on poor land are as much citizens as those born in more fortunate circumstances. Many of the children in less properous areas will later live in States and cities far from their place of birth. Their education is a national concern which is in no way lessened because they happen to be born where real estate is of low assessed value.

In its general report published in 1943, the Commission affirmed its earlier position and recommendation with respect to Federal aid to education in the States, pointing out in addition that:

> The Commission is fully aware of the dangers involved in bringing the Federal Government into the general field of school support. It has debated this problem over a period of 6 years and has become convinced that Federal aid is urgently required. It was never more important than it is now if we are to maintain and defend the ways of democracy.

3. THE NATIONAL COMMITTEE ON COORDINATION IN SECONDARY EDUCATION (1941)

The evaluating committee of the National Committee on Coordination in Secondary Education, appointed by the National Association of Secondary School Principals as a temporary advisory commission, issued in 1941 a report entitled "The Relationship of the Federal Government to the Education of Youth of Secondary-School Age." The committee declared that—

> The central issue is no longer, Shall the Federal Government accept increasingly important responsibilities in the field of education? Rather the issue has become, What educational responsibilities shall the Federal Government exercise and what methods shall it employ in discharging them?

The committee listed seven fundamental considerations affecting Federal-State-local relationships in education. Omitting the qualifying comments, the principles set forth by the committee included the following relating particularly to the Federal role:

> (1) The maintenance of a decentralized pattern of educational organization in which the vigor of State and local units of school administration is preserved. is highly desirable in the United States. This, however, requires revision of many existing local units of administration.
>
> (2) Various considerations urge that the Federal Government should accept carefully defined educational responsibilities and this is consistent with the maintenance of State and local initiative in education.
>
> * * * * * * *
>
> (4) Educational leadership as distinguished from educational control is a proper and major function of the Federal Government.
>
> (5) The provision of Federal funds for the partial financial support of education in the States is necessary and desirable, as a function of the Federal Government.
>
> * * * * * * *
>
> (7) Federal grants should be made for broad educational purposes, on objective bases of allocation, and without discretionary conditions, if the principles previously enunciated are to be observed by the Federal Government.

In the conclusion of its report the committee recommended:

> On the part of the Federal Government, transition from youth-serving agencies directly operated by the Federal Government to large-scale Federal participation in a nationwide education program operated through the public schools and intended to serve all youth according to their needs.

4. THE INTERSTATE COMMITTEE ON POSTWAR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT (1944)

In November 1942, the Board of Managers of the Council of State Governments recommended the development of memorandums dealing with wartime and postwar problems confronting the State governments. At its session in Baltimore in January 1942, the general assembly of the council approved the recommendations and outlined the scope and content of the program.

Regional conferences of State officials were held throughout the country to promote interest in the project and develop an effective organization and constructive plan of research, study, and drafting. Following the regional conferences, the interstate committee on postwar reconstruction and development was created to supervise and assist in the preparation of the memorandums.

Early in its deliberations, this committee defined three major responsibilities of the Council of State Governments, one of which was to develop an outline of principles and policies relative to postwar problems.

The following statement appears in the report of the interstate committee, which was published by the Council of State Governments in 1944:

> The problem of developing effective Federal relationships in education is one of the most important confronting the Nation. The present situation is unsatisfactory and confusing with likelihood of becoming worse, unless decisive action is taken to reorganize administrative machinery and improve relationships at all levels.
>
> At the National Government level, a great number of agencies are operating independently, each agency interested in its specific program and, in many instances, dealing directly with individual school authorities and agencies rather than as part of an adequately integrated national educational effort.
>
> In view of these developments and tendencies, it is obviously desirable and necessary that the following basic principles should be established as a guide for National-State cooperation in the field of public education.
>
> Control of education is a function of State government, under provision of article X of the Constitution, and should be administered by the States and their delegated political subdivisions. Participation by the National Government should be limited to financial aid and to providing leadership and information in the development of State policies and programs.
>
> Ultimate responsibility for public education rests with the people of the States, as expressed by them through the State constitutions and legislative acts. The States should provide for the effective administration of educational laws, as in the administration of other major functions of State government. Responsibility for educational planning, coordination, interpretation, and legislation is a function of State government and should be effectively discharged.

5. The Educational Policies Commission; and the Problems and Policies Committee (Joint Study, 1945)

In January 1945 the Educational Policies Commission sponsored by the National Education Association and the American Association of School Administrators, and the Problems and Policies Committee of the America Council on Education jointly engaged in a special study from which emanated a report entitled "Federal-State Relations in Education." The report presented combined pronouncements of the Educational Policies Commission and the Problems and Policies Committee, based upon long deliberations. The summary of the joint report reads in part as follows:

> Adequate organization for the provision of a fair educational opportunity for all children and youth will require some participation of the Federal Government in education. The experience of 150 years of national life, the compulsion of modern social demands, and the probable character of the period which lies ahead, all testify that Federal participation in education in the United States is a permanent phenomenon. Federal participation in education is no longer a debate. It has become a fact.
>
> The issue which still has to be settled is: Can Federal participation in education be kept within proper bounds and limits, or will it eventually swallow up all education in a system of centralized control and administration?

> The basic control of education can be kept in the States and localities, with the Federal Government assisting in the development of this service but refraining from dominating it, providing the issues involved in Federal-State relations in education are clearly understood and providing sound principles are formulated and observed in guiding the evolution of this important relationship.
>
> * * * * * * *
>
> The U.S. Government needs a clear-cut policy to define its relation to education. The chief elements of such a policy are (1) Federal grants to assure an adequate financial basis for education everywhere in the Nation; (2) distribution of the Federal grants on an objective basis which leaves the control of educational processes to the States and localities; and (3) well-organized Federal advisory and informational services and leadership concerning education. Such a policy would provide the educational program that this Nation must have for its own safety and for the well-being of its citizens.

6. THE COMMISSION ON IMPLICATIONS OF ARMED SERVICES EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS (1947)

With the approval of the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy, and with substantial funds made available by the Carnegie Corp. and the General Education Board, in 1945 the American Council on Education created and provided for extensive studies by the Commission on Implications of Armed Services Educational programs. On the basis of a number of previously published monographs, the commission in 1948 released a 264-page summary report on the lessons of the wartime armed services educational programs for American education. Concerning Federal aid for education the report said in part:

> It is difficult to arouse concern among our people regarding the need for national purposes in education. Following World I, educators were vitally interested in providing a program that would guarantee a more democratic society, while allowing every child an opportunity to develop his talents and abilities to the maximum. But following Pearl Harbor, our immediate concern was self-preservation, no matter what the cost, so large funds were provided for defense training without the slightest hesitation. If legislation to provide scholarships, adult education programs—including libraries—or aid to the common school system involving an equal or less amount were proposed in peacetime, considerable delays, no doubt, would be initiated. Whether the wartime college training programs, with all of their democratic implications, may be considered to be the incentive for action on Federal aid for education is a question, but there is ample evidence of the need for equalization of educational opportunity (pp. 253–254).

7. THE COMMISSION ON FINANCING HIGHER EDUCATION (1952)

On April 7, 1940, the trustees of the Rockefeller Foundation made a grant to the Association of American Universities for the creation of a Commission on Financing Higher Education. Because of its general interest in the subject, the Carengie Corp. of New York joined the Rockefeller Foundation in a participating grant for the work of the commission, which later published a number of studies.

In a volume entitled "Nature and Needs of Higher Education," published in 1952, the Commission presented its own conclusions. In regard to the question of Federal support for higher education the commission said in part:

> * * * The question calls for clear thinking devoid of partistanship, with a single objective—the country's welfare and preservation. It is the most important single question with which this commission has been faced. We have given it careful attention.

> The aid given by the Government to the education of veterans has been justly acclaimed as a wise, proper, and beneficial program. Though there have been frequent difficulties and irritation in the relations between the Government and the colleges and universities which the new legislation should largely remedy, we approve the principle of this type of recognition of individual services rendered to national defense.
>
> Second, we believe the Nation has greatly benefited from the services performed by institutions of higher education in managing research enterprises of critical importance to national defense. Both during and since the Second World War the institutions have rendered conspicuously successful service in providing our Armed Forces with effective modern weapons and techniques. This is a new type of enterprise in the history of higher education—one which has proved again how important to the Nation our colleges and universities are.
>
> At the same time we point out that there are dangers inherent in calling upon educational institutions too heavily for such services, except during all-out war. The educational activities of a university may be thrown out of balance by the great magnitude of the research work it is asked to perform. * * *
>
> Third, we recognize the benefits to higher education and to the Nation which have resulted from Government support of the education of scientists and of basic research in agriculture and the natural sciences. Although there are signs of danger which have appeared in these programs, they have not been serious. The Federal Government does not control academic research, and the Nation has vastly benefited from the strengthening of basic science made possible by this Federal aid.
>
> * * * Nevertheless, after giving due weight to all these considerations this Commission has reached the unanimous conclusion that we as a nation should call a halt at this time to the introduction of new programs of direct Federal aid to colleges and universities. We also believe it undesirable for the Government to expand the scope of its scholarship aid to individual students (pp. 155–158).

* * * * * * *

8. The National Citizens Commission for the Public Schools (1954)

The National Citizens Commission for the Public Schools was formed in May 1949, under a 6-year charter as a nonprofit corporation for the improvement of the public schools. Its members were U.S. citizens not professionally identified with education, religion, or politics. The commission received financial support from the Fund for the Republic, the General Education Board, the New York Community Trust, the Rockefeller Bros. Fund, and the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation.

A report approved by the commission on October 21, 1954, contains a statement relating to taxation for the support of education. The statement reads in part as follows:

> There is no doubt that the country will be able to pay for all the education needed a decade hence. The financing problem will be how to make available for education needs a relatively small percentage of our national income and production.
>
> In the past, public education has been financed mainly by property taxes levied by cities, towns, and school districts. Property taxes have been declining relatively as a source of funds for public schools. They provided about 85 percent during the war and 53 percent in the 1953–54 school year. They are based on assessments which rarely reflect true values of property. More important, property values do not share proportionately in increased levels of national income and production. In the decade ahead, property taxes cannot be relied upon to provide the increases in revenues needed to finance the increase in the country's expenditures for education.
>
> Income taxes and sales taxes have, on the other hand, been growing sources of school funds. They could be levied both by the States and by the Federal Government and could tap the increased volume of national production and income.

> In the next 10 years these taxes could provide the money needed to meet increased education costs without interfering with the operation of our economy (p. 6).

* * * * * * *

9. THE ROCKEFELLER PANEL ON EDUCATION (1958)

In 1958 the Rockefeller Bros. Fund financed studies by a panel on education composed of 15 persons prominent in several fields of American life. Nelson A. Rockefeller served as chairman of the panel, which issued a report entitled "The Pursuit of Excellence—Education and the Future of America." In its report, which was widely known as the Rockefeller Report on Education, the panel stated that—

> This report is a collaborative effort. Not every member of the panel subscribes to every detail, but it reflects our substantial agreement.

Concerning the Federal role in the financing of education, the report said in part:

> The proposals for Federal support of education have stimulated widespread public discussion; but there is an air of unreality about much of the debate. For a great deal of the debate centers around a doctrinal dispute over the dangers of such support. Over the years, while this full-dress discussion has been going on in the public eye, practical-minded legislators and executives on the one hand and hard-pressed educators on the other have been hammering out compromises almost unnoticed. And out of the these compromises over the years has come a great variety of well-established Federal programs in education. No discussion of Federal support to education can proceed on a sensible basis without first recognizing this fact. Federal programs in education now exist in large scale. They take a great many forms. It is certain that they will increase both in scale and variety. It is a stark fact that there are educational problems gravely affecting the national interest which may be soluble only through Federal action.
>
> Under the circumstances, it is important for those who are apprehensive about the growth of Federal support of education to examine the direction which it takes. There is no chance that we can turn back the clock and eliminate Federal support of education. There is a chance that farsighted men may influence the the direction of Federal support or the kinds of Federal support (pp. 33, 35).

10. THE PRESIDENT'S COMMISSION ON NATIONAL GOALS, 1960

President Dwight D. Eisenhower's Commission on National Goals was administered, at his request, by the American Assembly, Columbia University. The request was made in consideration of the status of the assembly as a nonpartisan educational institution and its established practices for encouraging wide discussion of public issues. (The assembly, founded in 1950 by Dwight D. Eisenhower as president of Columbia University, takes no official stand itself on public issues.)

Private financing and fiscal management of the Commission were provided under the auspices of the assembly. The following foundations gave financial support: Carnegie Corp. of New York, Maurice and Laura Falk Foundation, the Ford Foundation, Johnson Foundation (Racine), Richardson Foundation, the Rockefeller Foundation, Alfred P. Sloan Foundation, and United States Steel Foundation.

The Commission's report to the President, dated November 16, 1960, was signed by the following persons: Erwin D. Canham, James B. Conant, Colgate W. Darden, Jr., Crawford H. Greenewalt, Alfred

M. Gruenther, Clark Kerr, James R. Killian, Jr., George Meaney, Frank Pace, Jr., vice chairman; and Henry M. Wriston, chairman. The letter of transmittal stated that the report was being transmitted in response to the President's request to "develop a broad outline of coordinated national policies and programs" and to "set up a series of goals in various areas of activity."

With respect to goals for education the report said in part—

> Education is primarily a responsibility of the States. They have delegated responsibility for public elementary and secondary education to local authorities, and have chartered colleges and universities. This is the firmly established pattern; it can be made to function satisfactorily to meet the needs of our vast and diverse Nation.
>
> * * * * * * *
>
> Annual public and private expenditure for education by 1970 must be approximately $40 billion—double the 1960 figure. It will then be 5 percent or more of the gross national product, as against less than 4 percent today.
>
> Most of these funds must continue to come from State and local governments, tuition payments, and gifts. State and local appropriations have more than doubled since 1950. The Federal role must now be expanded. Total government expenses at all levels must amount to $33 billion for education by 1970.
>
> Federal aid to higher education must include increased scholarship and loan funds, support of research as an essential part of the educational process, and direct assistance for buildings and equipment.
>
> The Federal Government should supplement State funds where per capita income is too low to maintain an adequate school program. It should also offer matching grants, for educational purposes to be determined by the States. Since the Northwest Ordinance of 1787, the Federal Government has participated in the support of education without destroying local initiative and responsibility. In the future those values should still be safeguarded.[19]

---

[19] The Report of the President's Commission on National Goals. New York, the American Assembly, Columbia University. November 1960, pp. 6–7.

CHAPTER 6. POLICIES ADVOCATED BY ACTIVE GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES AND PRIVATE ORGANIZATIONS

This chapter summarizes the views on Federal educational policies advanced by presently active agencies and organizations, public and private, as distinguished from ad hoc temporary advisory commissions dealt with in the preceding chapter.

By issuing policy statements, adopting resolutions, and in other ways, presently active agencies and organizations have expressed their views concerning existing and proposed Federal educational policies and programs. According to information obtained from representatives of these agencies and organizations, the positions set forth in this chapter may be considered current as of the time of this writing,[1] although some of these positions were established several years ago.

There is some similarity in the procedures through which the various types of agencies and organizations have indicated their attitudes on these matters. There is also some similarity in the degree to which the expressions from the organizations represent the opinions of their constituent members. However, in both of these respects the material included in the following presentation varies considerably. This material is nevertheless significant since it reveals in some cases perhaps fully and in other cases to a reasonable degree, the attitudes of the members of a number of important national agencies and organizations as a whole toward matters under consideration in this report.

The expressions of opinion in the following pages have emanated from agencies and organizations interested in education and representative of various cross sections of American life. No doubt many organized groups not named herein have also taken positions in relation to questions of Federal policy in educational matters. However, the limitations on space allowance for this report and on the time available for this preparation have required that the following material be selective rather than inclusive, both with regard to the number of agencies and organizations whose positions have been investigated by the writer and the length of their respective expressions of opinion which have been included herein.

Some organizations that were invited to supply copies of resolutions or policy expressions from their membership failed to do so within the time limitations or replied that they had no such material.

Besides policy statements, resolutions, and other material issued by the enumerated agencies and organizations, the following presentation includes information obtained by correspondence and conferences between the writer of this report and their administrative officials. Personal statements by organizational officials in hearings before congressional committees generally have not been included in this chapter.

---

[1] Fall, 1967. This chapter was mainly prepared in November 1967.

The grouping of the agencies and organizations under the several headings in this chapter is intended to aid the reader rather than to strictly categorize any agency or organization. The headings are not intended to be mutually exclusive. It is here recognized, for example, that a "church agency" might also be an "educational association," and vice versa.

A. PRINCIPAL U.S. GOVERNMENT EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES

1. The Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

The organization and functions of the Office of Education, which is the central educational agency of the Federal Government, have been described in an earlier chapter of this report.

The position of the Office of Education relating to educational issues before the Congress has been expressed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and by the Commissioner of Education in the form of recommended legislation, reports on proposed legislation, and testimony presented before the several committees of the Congress having appropriate jurisdiction.

The following statement summarizes the positions of the Office of Education respecting certain educational questions of current national interest. The statement was prepared in the Office of Education under date of October 5, 1967, and approved by the Commissioner of Education, specifically for inclusion in this report.

> The program of the Office of Education reflects the conviction of the Congress and millions of Americans throughout the Nation that every child, youth, and adult should be given the opportunity for the best education our human and financial resources can command. Although the education legislation enacted during the first half of this decade has placed vast, new responsibilities on the Office of Education for administering programs designed to insure equality of educational opportunity, the Office views its role as that of a junior partner in the Federal-State-local education partnership. To this partnership, the Office of Education provides both financial assistance and a national perspective for improving quality and availability of education programs. Since Federal resources for education purposes are limited, the Office of Education focuses particular attention on programs which promise to eliminate those education problems identified by Congress as being the greatest obstacles to the growth and development of the Nation—obstacles which prevent each individual from obtaining an education commensurate with his desires and abilities.
>
> The current legislative program of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare includes a number of recommendations to the Congress for further Federal action in the areas of education essential to the national interest. Certain of these recommendations are listed below:
>
> *1. Amendments to and expansion of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965*
>
> The six major titles of this comprehensive act provide the broadest and most permissive authority to strengthen State departments of education, stimulate educational expansion and innovation, acquire the latest and best instructional materials and library resources, and particularly, to focus assistance on the problems of the education of disadvantaged children, including the physically and mentally disadvantaged. Before the enactment of this law, State and local school districts were limited, both in terms of manpower and financial resources in providing both essential and innovative, supplementary educational programs

The requested amendments include: the participation of Indian children and children in overseas dependents schools of the Department of Defense in appropriate titles; technical amendments to the federally impacted areas programs. Public Law 874 and Public Law 815; extension and improvement of educational and related services for handicapped children; comprehensive planning and evaluation of education at all levels; and innovation in vocational education.

2. *Higher education amendments of 1967*

These amendments affect a number of existing laws and are also designed to consolidate existing authority into more efficient and effective programs.

(*a*) *The Higher Education Act of 1965.*—Programs supported by the Higher Education Act have touched thousands of students and colleges throughout the United States. This act truly forms one of the important bases of our total commitment to assuring equal educational opportunity by providing assistance to meet a variety of purposes: continuing education programs; improved library resources; strengthening of developing institutions; student financial assistance opportunities; teacher training programs; and improvement of undergraduate instruction. The Higher Education Act would be amended to provide early extension of the act due to expire at the end of fiscal year 1968. This would allow schools, colleges, and universities more ample leadtime for educational, fiscal, and manpower planning. Of particular concern is the extension of the guaranteed student loan program, included in title IV of the act as a necessary component of the total commitment to improving the higher education opportunities and services for college-bound youth. This program was specifically included in the Higher Education Act as a means of encouraging States and nonprofit private institutions and organizations to establish loan guarantee programs for students attending institutions of higher education. The guaranteed student loan program amendments would authorize the Federal Government to pay the lender a service fee for loans processed; would authorize the Federal Government to retain and accumulate the Federal interest payments on student loans and pay such accumulation to the lender when the final payment falls due; would authorize the merging of the guaranteed student loan program with the insured loan program for vocational school students; authorize the Commissioner of Education to guarantee 80 percent of each student loan insured by a State or nonprofit private institution; and authorize that an additional $12.5 million be provided as advances to State and nonprofit private student loan insurance programs after fiscal year 1968 where matched by equal non-Federal funds for the same purpose.

(*b*) *Extension of the National Defense Education Act of 1958.*—The NDEA enacted in 1958 to meet the immediate goal of increasing the supply of highly trained manpower in fields relating to security—science, mathematics, and foreign languages—has had increasing impact on the quality and availability of American education. It has been amended to cover virtually all areas of education, at all levels. It is proposed that this act be extended early to allow schools and colleges more ample leadtime for educational, fiscal, and manpower planning. Subject limitations would be eliminated from the various programs supported under the act; loan cancellation benefits would be extended to teachers in programs of special education or training designed to combat disadvantage, poverty, or unemployment. In addition, non-Federal capital for NDEA student loans would be encouraged by establishing a revolving fund from which institutions may obtain loans. Several titles are not being requested for extension since they may be carried out under other legislative provisions. The statistical services provided under title X, for example, may now be supported under title V of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. The highly successful title XI Teacher Training Institute program has been incorporated into the Education Professions Development Act of 1967, Public Law 90-35.

(*c*) *Education Professions Development Act of 1967 and Teacher Corps.*—This act, passed in June 1967, was included as part of both the Higher Education Amendments and the Elementary and Secondary Amendments of 1967. It is designed to broaden, coordinate, and strengthen programs for the training and improvement of teachers and other educational personnel. This act extends through fiscal year 1970 title V of the Higher Education Act of 1965, including the Teacher Corps program. In addition, it authorizes the establishment of a National Advisory Council on Education Professions Development and four new programs. They will provide (1) grants and contracts for the purpose of attracting qualified persons to the field of education; (2) grants to local educational agencies experiencing critical shortages of teachers to attract and qualify teachers and teacher aides; (3) grants and contracts to provide advanced training and retraining (preservice and inservice) for personnel serving in program of elementary and secondary education; and (4) fellowships, traineeships, institutes, and preservice and inservice training for personnel serving as teachers, administrators, or educational specialists in colleges and universities. The fellowship program is extended to include graduate education for preschool and adult and vocational education personnel.

3. Education for the public service

The bill would establish in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare a program of institutional grants and graduate fellowships designed to attract young men and women to public service in any branch of State, local, or Federal government, and to improve education for such service.

Title I of the bill would authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to make grants to or contracts with institutions of higher education (and other designated public or private agencies in special circumstances) to assist them in preparing graduate or professional students to enter the public service, or for research into, or development or demonstration of, improved methods of educating students (including students at the undergraduate level) for the public service.

Title II of the bill would authorize the Secretary to award fellowships, not to exceed 3 academic years in duration, for graduate or professional study for persons who plan to pursue a career in public service. Fellowships would be equitably distributed throughout the United States among institutions of higher education that have, or are developing, programs of high quality intended to educate persons for the public service or which contributed to the meeting of a significant and continuing need in the public service, except that preference could be given to programs designed to meet an urgent national need.

4. Educational television

Title I of the 1967 public broadcasting bill would extend for 3 years the 1962 Educational Television Facilities Act which authorized the acquisition and installation of equipment for noncommercial educational television broadcasting. Noncommercial radio broadcasting facilities would be added as a new category. In addition, title II of the public broadcasting bill would authorize the creation of a nonprofit, nongovernmental corporation for public broadcasting to improve the quality of noncommercial radio and television programs. Title III would authorize the Secretary to understake a comprehensive study of instructional television broadcasting directed primarily for classroom use.

2. The National Science Foundation

The organization and functions of the National Science Foundation (which is one of the two Federal agencies whose primary concern is education) have been described in an earlier chapter of this report.

The following statement summarizes the position of the National Science Foundation relating to Federal policy for the promotion of science education through programs of the National Science Foundation and other Federal agencies. This statement was prepared in the National Science Foundation and approved by its Director, as of October 26, 1967, specifically for inclusion in this report.

Background considerations

The Foundation's initial and continuing examination of the nature and state of education in the sciences disclosed that science education, like other aspects of education, is necessarily a cumulative process. Each level builds upon the preceding; each conditions the following. Unresolved difficulties at one level inevitably place limitations on subsequent levels. Because of the cumulative nature of the process, NSF has attempted to identify the salient problems at each level of science education and to devise activities to ease the most important of them. This course has been chosen quite deliberately in contradistinction to one which concentrates heavily upon only one aspect of level and excludes the others.

It is also clear that a program intended to assist in the improvement of science education cannot remain static. While certain problems such as the updating of teachers and curriculums need continual attention, many factors do change. Successes in one level or aspect generate changed conditions in others. But the process is gradual. The result is an overall NSF education program that contains a number of elements related to each other, and the total aspect of the program is changed slowly over the years in response to slowly changing conditions. Changing conditions are not only those of the educational process itself but also the changes in the amount and sources of educational financing and the extent to which educational institutions and authorities are willing to accept changes.

The problems

The principal problems in science education to which the NSF education programs are addressed are—

(1) too many teachers are inadequately prepared in the subjects they teach, either because of weakness in their initial training or because they have not kept up to date;

(2) textbooks, courses, teachers' guides, and other teaching aids have not kept pace with either the advances of subject matter or increased understanding of what and how students can learn;

(3) many science-capable and science-oriented high school and college students are inadequately challenged by the schooling normally available to them;

(4) at the graduate level many able students need financial support to continue their formal education through the advanced degree; and

(5) some institutions of higher education and many school systems seem to lack interest in improving themselves; others—growing in number—are developing the interest but lack some of the resources and expertise necessary to the task.

Unless rectified, these deficiencies will continue to hamper the development and growth of U.S. science and, in particular, our capability to advance the frontiers of knowledge.

Three other problem areas have been identified but are not yet included in any appreciable way in the NSF education program. First is the financial support of undergraduates. Although legislation explicitly authorizes NSF to offer undergraduate scholarships (NSF Act, sec. 10), the Foundation has not yet begun such a program. However, support is being provided to a limited number of outstanding undergraduate science majors during the summer months to participate in research and independent study. Second is the problem of facilities. Except for academic facilities directly related to scientific research, NSF does not deal with this massive problem. Third is the initial training of schoolteachers of science and mathematics. Clearly the initial training of schoolteachers requires a comprehensive as well as specialized training. The Foundation's small and experimental activities in this area of preservice training have not yet struck a fully responsive chord in most institutions which train teachers. Apathy is still prevalent in most and no way has yet been devised to bypass or overcome this apathy effectively, but various approaches are being considered.

The continuing program

The educational activity of NSF—a balanced set of programs which collectively deal with all levels of science education—is discussed in some detail in parts II and III of this document. Programs directed toward the precollege levels are designed to affect the educational system itself. Moving toward the higher levels, one encounters at the senior high school level the first programs for individual students. These are essentially advanced enrichment programs for some fraction of the high-ability, science-oriented students (currently about one of every 20 such students) who can be so identified at that educational level. The undergraduate level is transitional, having elements for the improvement of the quality of instruction, the strengthening of academic institutions themselves, and enriched programs for the ablest students. At still higher levels, the overall program shifts emphasis from improving the teachers and books, et cetera, to students so that at the graduate levels and beyond it is largely one of direct support of the most talented science-committed students.

The basic mechanism for improving the competence of current teachers is the institute, an instructional project in which some aspect of subject matter is taught intensively to a selected group of teachers. Within the institute framework there is much variation as to subject matter, timing, and duration of project, competence level of participants—some are for secondary school teachers with no training in a subject they teach; some, for relatively well trained individuals, both college and secondary school teachers—and method of organizing and conducting the institutes themselves. Supplemental to the institutes are minor programs such as those which provide some research experience to some who have reached that stage and would be better teachers for having had such experience.

Course, curriculums, and teaching aid development is handled in several ways. The first is that of support of teams of distinguished scientists, teachers, and psychologists who design fresh new courses and the materials necessary to teach them. The development of the materials is supported but not their provision to user schools, the latter being handled through the usual commercial processes with royalties returned to the U.S. Treasury. The second method is through the support of groups who study curriculums and make recommendations about what they ought to be like; in effect, they set up standards as guidelines. They also help individuals and colleges to effect improvements in their courses and curriculums. There is also provision for testing, on small scale, quite new and different units and instructional techniques.

Programs are available for a relatively small number of science-capable, science-oriented students at the higher secondary school level, higher undergraduate college level and postbaccalaureate level. Those at the two lower levels provide special education in the sciences rather than support of the students as such. Those at the postbaccalaureate level provide direct student support through either fellowships or traineeships.

The NSF science education program also provides some support—usually only supplemental—by which school systems and colleges can obtain the expert assistance needed in order for them to bring about reforms in science education in their own programs. This support may include curriculum and course development and implementation, and relevant teacher and student training.

Lastly, the NSF program provides minor but very important financial support for innovative experiments in science education and the nature of the teaching-learning process.

The basic mechanism of support for all of these activities is the grant made in support of a proposal received from interested and competent scientists acting under the aegis of, usually, a college or university. Proposals are evaluated competitively. Grants—except fellowships—are made to sponsoring institutions.

The NSF science education program represents approximately 0.3 percent of the Nation's expenditures in education for the 1966–67 school year and approximately 2.4 percent of the Federal expenditures for education in the same year.

The Foundation's level of effort, it will be noted, is very small as compared with both the national and Federal levels of effort. This requires that, if NSF "education funds" are to have a significant impact on education generally or education in the sciences specifically, they must be pinpointed in highly specific ways. Small levers have to be placed very carefully at selected spots along the length of the system. The ongoing and proposed program is of that nature. The effectiveness of this approach is attested by the profound effect the program has had on American education to date. So conspicuous have these effects become that nations all over the world, highly advanced and developing alike, are beginning to use the NSF methods and are coming to NSF in increasing numbers for information about these methods and for assistance in applying them. NSF is now regarded around the world as the leading group helping to bring about improvements in science education.

Related NSF programs

Certain other NSF programs, although not categorized as part of the science education activities as such, do have an important educational impact. The nature and size of the science education activities reflect these. Most notable are the support of basic research projects in colleges and universities because most research projects include graduate students who learn by doing research. The institutional base grants provide certain funds for science which, at the discretion of the grantee institution, are usually programed for activities which are directly or indirectly beneficial to instruction in the sciences. The three major institutional development programs (university, departmental, and college) are, because they pertain specifically to the development of some part of the institution's science program, related to science education; the college science development program is limited to the instructional aspects. Each of these programs, in its own way, is strengthening the scientific capability of the Nation and reducing to some degree the geographic imbalance in such resources.

Related programs of other agencies

To the extent that it is possible, relevant programs of other agencies have been taken into account in determining the nature and size of the program of the Foundation. Three areas are principally involved. Several other agencies provide support for postbaccalaureate students (fellowships and traineeships). Over the years there has developed a continuing coordination among the several agencies which leads to a kind of sharing, each agency planning on picking up some appropriate portion of the total Federal investment in this area. This technique helps prevent excessive support and duplication. NSF and USOE share an interest in curriculum development. Because NSF is limited to the science area, USOE places its major support in the nonscience area. Within the science area the two agencies cooperate directly—occasionally through joint support, more frequently by proposal transfer. The latter is especially appropriate since the NSF effort is polarized around subject matter; the USOE effort, around method of instruction. The third area is support for scientific equipment necessary for the instruction of undergraduate students. Here experience has shown that possible overlap is more theoretical than real. The NSF program provides matching grants to purchase instructional equipment related to improving the way a subject is taught; the USOE program supports the purchase of additional equipment needed to meet increasing enrollments. The objectives of the two complementary programs are sufficiently different so that only a rare proposal fits both. Those received in the inappropriate program in one agency are transferred to the appropriate program in the other.

B. OTHER GOVERNMENTAL BODIES (COMMISSIONS, COUNCILS, ETC.)

1. Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations

This Commission was established by act of September 24, 1959, as amended by act of November 2, 1966 (73 Stat. 703, 80 Stat. 1162; 5 U.S.C. 2371), to bring together representatives of Federal, State, and local governments for consideration of common problems; to discuss the administration of Federal grant programs and the controls involved in their administration; to make available technical assistance to the executive and legislative branches of the Federal Government in the review of proposed legislation; to discuss emerging public problems that are likely to require intergovernmental cooperation; to recommend the most desirable allocation of governmental functions; to recommend methods of coordinating and simplifying tax laws and practices to achieve a more orderly and less competitive fiscal relationship between the levels of government; to reduce the burden of compliance for taxpayers, and to authorize receipt of non-Federal funds.

In October 1967 the Commission recommended a wide-ranging program of congressional and State legislative action. Recommendations particularly affecting or pertaining to the Federal role in financial support of education included the following:

* * * * * * *

> 1. Adoption of a flexible combination of Federal financial assistance to States and localities to consist of categorical grants-in-aid, general functional block grants, and per capita general support payments. * * *
>
> * * * * * * *
>
> 7. Federal encouragement and financial assistance for multidistrict educational arrangements.
>
> 8. Addition of factors in State school aid formulas to reflect higher per pupil costs for disadvantaged children, especially in densely populated areas; amendment to Elementary and Secondary Education Act to authorize use of available grant funds in support of such action.

* * * * * * *

16. Improved coordination, through the Executive Office of the President, of Federal grant programs being administered by a variety of Federal departments and agencies.

17. Decentralization to Federal regional offices of review and approval of plans resulting from Federal formula-type grants to State and local governments. Reduction in the wide variations in boundaries of Federal administrative regions.

2. BOARD OF FOREIGN SCHOLARSHIPS

The Board of Foreign Scholarships, a Presidentially appointed public body drawn principally from the American academic community, is responsible for supervising the educational exchange programs authorized by the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961 (Public Law 87–256). It selects annually over 5,000 American and foreign students, teachers, and professors for study, teaching, or research abroad, or in the United States under academic exchange programs administered by the Department of State and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

In 1964 and 1965, the Board adopted a series of policy guidelines and recommendations relating to the planning of the academic exchange programs financed by public funds, including the following still in effect:

> (1) The primary emphasis in the educational exchange program should be on academic quality; (2) as a long-range objective, there should be a reasonable equivalence between the number of grantees from the United States to foreign countries and vice versa; (3) individual exchange programs should permit a high degree of flexibility; (4) in defining the word "binationality" as it pertains to academic exchanges, the Board interprets it as a principle which permits common academic efforts for common academic goals, involving an exchange of talents and services across national lines; (5) the binational commissions will be requested to plan continuing projects on a 3- to 5-year basis to permit advance recruitment.

3. COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

The Commission on Civil Rights was established by act of September 9, 1957 (71 Stat. 634, as amended; 42 U.S.C. 1975) to carry out specified functions relating to civil rights, including submittal of reports to the President and to the Congress.

A 1967 report of the Commission entitled "Racial Isolation in the Public Schools" contains the following principal legislative recommendations (some of which are elaborated upon in the report):

> 1. Congress should establish a uniform standard providing for the elimination of racial isolation in the schools.
> 2. Congress should vest in each of the 50 States responsibility for meeting the standard it establishes and should allow the States maximum flexibility in devising appropriate remedies. It also should provide financial and technical assistance to the States in planning such remedies.
> 3. The legislation should include programs of substantial financial assistance to provide for construction of new facilities and improvement in the quality of education in all schools.
> 4. Congress should provide for adequate time in which to accomplish the objectives of the legislation.

4. COUNCIL ON INTERNATIONAL EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL AFFAIRS

The Council on International Educational and Cultural Affairs was established on January 20, 1964, by Department of State Affairs Manual Circular No. 165A. The authority for the establishment of the Council was section 6 of Executive Order 11034 of June 25, 1962.

Membership of the Council includes representatives of the following agencies which have programs that are essentially international in purpose and impact: Department of State, Agency for International Development, Department of Defense, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Peace Corps, and U.S. Information Agency.

On February 20, 1967, the Council set forth a number of recommendations including the following:

> The U.S. Government should encourage selected American colleges and universities, with large concentrations of foreign academic visitors from developing countries which are experiencing skilled manpower shortages, to stimulate the return of these visitors.

5. Federal Council for Science and Technology

The Federal Council for Science and Technology was established by Executive Order 10807 of March 13, 1959, (1) to provide more effective planning and administration of Federal scientific and technological programs, (2) to identify research needs including areas of research requiring additional emphasis, (3) to achieve more effective utilization of the scientific and technological resources and facilities of Federal agencies, including the elimination of unnecessary duplication, and (4) to further international cooperation in science and technology.

In carrying out this responsibility, the Council conducted studies which led to the following Presidential statement of policy dated September 13, 1965:

> To the fullest extent compatible with their primary interests in specific fields of science, their basic statutes, and their needs for research results in high quality, all Federal agencies should act so as to (*a*) encourage the maintenance of outstanding quality in science and science education in those universities where it exists; (*b*) provide research funds to academic institutions under conditions affording them the opportunity to improve and extend their programs for research and science education and to develop the potentialities for high quality research of groups and individuals, including capable younger faculty members; (*c*) contribute to the improvement of potentially strong universities through measures such as giving consideration, where research capability of comparable quality exists, to awarding grants and contracts to institutions not now heavily engaged in Federal research programs; and, assisting such institutions or parts of institutions in strengthening themselves while performing research relevant to agency missions, by such means as establishing university-administered programs in specialized areas relevant to the missions of the agencies.

6. National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children

The Council was established by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (79 Stat. 34; 20 U.S.C. 241*l*), for the purpose of reviewing the administration and operation of the provisions of title I of the act, including its effectiveness in improving the educational attainment of educationally deprived children. The Council submits an annual report of its findings and recommendations to the President and the Congress.

In its annual report dated January 31, 1967 the Council expressed six recommendations for action by educators at all levels, including the following concerning the Federal role:

> Development of a strengthened advisory role for the Federal Government in disseminating the local experience of Title I teachers and administrators, yet one which would not encroach upon local initiative and control.* * *

7. NATIONAL REVIEW BOARD FOR THE CENTER FOR CULTURAL AND TECHNICAL INTERCHANGE BETWEEN EAST AND WEST

The Board was established under authority of the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948, as amended (62 Stat. 11; 22 U.S.C. 1471), and the Mutual Security Act of 1960 (74 Stat. 141; 22 U.S.C. 2054) to represent the national interest by reviewing the program and operations of the East-West Center and giving advice and guidance to the Department of State in the field of international education.

The National Review Board noted in its first report in February 1967 that the Center is a major element in the U.S. Government's peace program in Asia, and that its resources make it a logical place for implementation of key aspects of the President's program in the field of international education.

8. PANEL ON EDUCATIONAL INNOVATION

The Panel was established in 1966 under the auspices of the Office of Science and Technology. A report of the Panel released for public discussion in 1967 by the Special Assistant to the President for Science and Technology (who is also director of the Panel of Science and Technology) the U.S. Commissioner of Education, and the Director of the National Science Foundation made the following recommendation:

> The Panel recommends establishment of a bank, which might be called the Educational Opportunity Bank (Ed Op Bank), as an agency of the Federal Government. In order to obtain funds, the bank should be authorized to borrow money at going Government rates. It should be authorized to lend money to postsecondary students, regardless of the student's resources. A student should be able to borrow enough money to cover his tuition, costs, and subsistence at whatever college, university, or other postsecondary institution he is admitted to. The bank would recoup these loans through annual payments collected in conjunction with the borrower's future income tax. At the time a loan was granted, the borrower would pledge a percentage of his future income for a fixed number of years after graduation. The Panel recommends that the number of years for repayment be 30, or perhaps 40, years. This period would be a fixed term for all borrowers. The percentage if income pledged would be proportional to the amount borrowed. Preliminary estimates are that the bank could be self-sustaining if it charged borrowers 1 percent of gross income over 30 years for each $3,000 borrowed.

9. PRESIDENT'S COUNCIL ON AGING

The Council was established by Executive Order 11022 of May 14, 1962, to (*a*) maintain continuing review of Federal responsibilities relating to aging, and make recommendations to the President, (*b*) seek appropriate coordination of Federal program in aging (*c*) promote exchange of information relating to aging among Federal agencies and between them and other public and private agencies and organizations, and (*d*) prepare an annual report on Federal activities in aging.

The annual report of the Council dated December 31, 1964, contains the following declaration regarding Federal concern for education of the aging.

> Whatever else we do for the aged, we must arouse their curiosity, stimulate their imagination, keep their minds at work, or we will have failed to make the retirement years rich, rewarding, or satisfying. Thus, education for the aging, education about the aging, and education by the aging are Federal concerns. * * *

10. President's Committee on Mental Retardation

The Committee was established by Executive Order 11280 of May 11, 1966, to provide advice and assistance to the President on the subject of mental retardation, to mobilize support for mental retardation activities at the Federal, State, and local levels, and to make reports and recommendations to the President to reduce the incidence of mental retardation.

In its first report to the President, in 1967, the Committee listed 10 "action areas in which concerted National, State, and local effort by public agencies and private voluntary organizations can produce significant progress in combating mental retardation and lessening its effects." In the accompanying comments these "action areas" are generally related to education and training. The list follows:

> 1. Mental retardation services must be available to more of the Nation's people. * * *
> 2. More effective and extensive manpower recruitment and training programs for work with the mentally retarded are needed. * * *
> 3. Fuller use of existing resources is a necessity. * * *
> 4. More public-private partnerships in program development, services, and research are needed. * * *
> 5. A national mental retardation information and resource center should be developed. * * *
> 6. Basic research, training in application of research, and rapid translation of research results into service program uses need continuing encouragment. * * *
> 7. Immediate, major attention should be given to early identification and treatment of the mentally retarded.
> 8. Social and institutional planning for the coming decades must take into account the special needs of the mentally retarded. * * *
> 9. The legal status of the mentally retarded individual must be clarified and his rights guaranteed.
> 10. Lastly, we urge that everyone interested in helping the mentally retarded and combating retardation give thought to imaginative ideas and approaches that will make new advances possible.

11. President's Science Advisory Committee

A Science Advisory Committee was established by President Truman on April 20, 1951, within the Office of Defense Mobilization. The Committee was reconstituted by President Johnson as the President's Science Advisory Committee and an enlarged membership was announced by the White House on November 22, 1957.

A 1967 report of the Committee entitled "Computers in Higher Education" recommended "that the Federal Government expand its support of both research and education in computer sciences."

A 1962 report of the Committee entitled "Meeting Manpower Needs in Science and Technology" recommended coordination of all types of Federal support for graduate training "to insure an appropriately balanced scale of ample stipends."

12. U.S. Advisory Commission on Information

The U.S. Advisory Commission on Information was established by act of January 27, 1948, to recommend policies and programs for carrying out the purposes of the act concerning international information activities. The Commission transmits to the Congress an annual report of all activities carried on under the authority of the act, including appraisals, where feasible, as to the effectiveness of the programs.

The 22d report of the U.S. Advisory Commission on Information, dated March 1967, contains recommendations to Congress reading in part as follows:

> It is the foreign service public affairs officers, cultural affairs officers, information officers, librarians, labor information officers, student affairs grantees, radio and television and motion picture officers who talk with editors, writers, and commentators, who counsel with, guide and advise exchange students, professors and scholars, who arrange for and publicize the artistic and musical extravaganzas, who provide foreign parliamentarians and appointed officials with reliable information about U.S. policies and intentions, who speak to foreign audiences, who create exhibits, lend books, show motion pictures or place television and radio programs on local stations, who talk to labor groups and enter into dialogs with students about the United States. They represent the United States, not with foreign offices and prime ministers, but with people from every walk of life who have prejudices as well as curiosity about the United States.
>
> Such representatives of the United States need a congressional sanctioned career system. The Commission urgently recommends that Congress make every effort to grant them one.
>
> * * * * * * *
>
> The American taxpayer should no longer be prohibited from seeing and studying the product a Government agency produces with public funds for overseas audiences. Students in schools and colleges all over this country who are interested in government, foreign affairs, and international relations should not be denied access to what the U.S. Government is saying about itself and the rest of the world. The Commission recommends that the Congress effect the same "open door" policy on overseas-intended information materials as decreed by the "Freedom of Information" Act (the Moss Act, passed July 4, 1966) for domestically based governmental operations. * * *

13. U.S. Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs

The Commission was established by act of September 31, 1961 (75 Stat. 532; 22 U.S.C. 2456), to formulate and recommend to the President policies for exercising his authority under this act, to appraise the effectiveness of programs carried out pursuant to it, and to report thereon to the Congress and the public in the United States and abroad to develop a better understanding of and support for the programs authorized by this act.

In its fifth annual report dated December 1967 the Commission stated:

> * * * In order to regain and maintain the integrity of the educational and cultural exchange programs of the U.S. Government, the Commission urges the establishment of a separate public-private entity—a recommendation of the Katzenbach panel—to assume complete responsibility for these programs, which are presently handled by several Government agencies.

The Commission also believes it is imperative that the Government separate the administration of educational and cultural exchange programs from those of information and intelligence-gathering activities.

14. U.S. National Commission for UNESCO

The U.S. National Commission for UNESCO was established in 1946 under the authority of Public Law 565, to advise the Government of the United States on the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) program matters, to provide liaison with organizations and individuals in the United States interested in UNESCO, to act in a consultative capacity with regard to the appointment of the U.S. delegates to the General Conference of UNESCO, and to promote an understanding of the general objectives of UNESCO in the United States.

The National Commission is composed of 100 members, which includes 60 representatives of national voluntary organizations and 40 other persons interested in educational, scientific, and cultural matters.

Following is an excerpt from a statement by the U.S. National Commission for UNESCO in connection with the 20th anniversary of UNESCO, 1966.

> Twenty years ago a bold idea was put to the test—whether the world can pursue peace and the betterment of mankind more effectively by an intensive cooperative effort which harnesses education, science, and culture to the task.
>
> * * * We publicly affirm our faith and our hope in UNESCO. We call upon the people of the United States to join us in study of UNESCO's potentials and its challenges. We request the Congress and other agencies of our Government to continue and, indeed, to increase their support for UNESCO and its objectives.

C. ORGANIZATIONS OF STATE AND LOCAL SCHOOL OFFICIALS

1. American Association of School Administrators

The American Association of School Administrators is a national professional organization dedicated to the improvement and advancement of public education, particularly through upgrading the quality of educational administration and strengthening the capabilities and resources of superintendents of schools. The association, which was organized in 1865, had a membership in 1967 of approximately 17,000, consisting primarily of local, county, and State superintendents of schools; assistant, associate, and deputy superintendents of schools; heads of departments of colleges of education; and professors of education and of educational administration.

The resolutions, adopted each year at the national conference, are the major policy-setting instrument of the association. Following are excerpts from resolutions, reflecting the association's position concerning the Federal role in education, among those adopted by members attending the 1967 national conference.

Federal Aid to Education

> While we acknowledge that the Federal Government has a vital interest in helping schools alleviate current problems arising from the complexity of our society, the Federal Government should recognize that although American education is of Federal concern, it is a State responsibility and a local function.
>
> Consistent with this philosophy we urge the Federal Government to acknowledge the need for greater general financial support to improve all programs in public education. Existing categorical-aid programs should be revised to permit the greatest possible flexibility in expenditures in keeping with the broad social

goals of the programs. Future Federal assistance should be provided in the form of long-term general aid which takes into account ability to pay and is subject only to normal auditing controls.

The Role of the Office of Education

Recently enacted Federal laws, such as the Economic Opportunity Act, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, and the Vocational Education Act, will continue to have a definite impact on the thrust of American education.

We strongly urge that AASA members carefully study these Federal programs and call attention to duplication of effort, to educational goals of dubious value, and to any instance of operational inefficiency in new programs. We further urge that all major Federal educational programs focusing primarily on elementary and secondary children be transferred to and administered by the U.S. Office of Education, which should function through the State departments of education in contacts with local school districts.

National testing and assessment programs

The AASA reaffirms its opposition to any act which would in effect establish a national testing program or a national curriculum. Attempts to evaluate or compare systems or regions through a prescribed national test uniformly applied can only result in a curriculum structure which will vitiate attempts of local schools to serve individual pupils. We believe that such a high degree of centralization infringes not only upon the legal responsibilities of the State and the local school systems, but also upon the professional responsibilities of the individual teacher, as well, and that it will inevitably hinder or defeat the declared aim of American education.

The problem of assessment is more complicated. Assessment improperly used could result in the undesired effects listed above.

The neighborhood school

Desperate educational inequities currently exist in the great urban centers of America. * * *

* * * The AASA therefore urges the Federal Government, the several States, and the great urban centers to bring together knowledge, manpower, and financial support in a massive effort to generate imaginative ways to reduce these desperate inequities.

The "neighborhood" school can be used irresponsibly to perpetuate "de facto" segregation, but it remains the most socially and educationally sound of the competing patterns of district organization, particularly if the term "neighborhood" is defined in a sociological context. Plans which omit it or seriously alter the basic characteristics of the concept may eventually damage the quality of education and not be effective in helping to solve the large urban problems over a long period of time.

2. COUNCIL OF CHIEF STATE SCHOOL OFFICERS

Established in 1928, the Council of Chief State School Officers is an organization of State superintendents and commissioners of education, entirely independent of any other professional or official organization. Its membership includes the 50 State school officers plus the heads of education agencies in American Samoa, the Canal Zone, Guam, Puerto Rico, the Trust Territory of the Pacific, and the Virgin Islands. These officials are responsible for the administration and development of education in their States or territories.

The following resolutions on Federal-State educational relationships were adopted by vote of the membership of the council at its annual business meeting in New Orleans, La., on November 18, 1966:

(1) State responsibility for administration of title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965

The council approves the purposes of title III. It provides for the development of supplementary centers and services to improve the quality and quantity of education; to increase the use of results of educational experimentation, research and creativeness in teaching and learning; and to stimulate broad local, State, and Federal cooperation in providing exceptional educational opportunities for all children and youth.

An analysis of the first year's title III results shows that States in which the State departments of education have assumed responsibility for organization and direction of title III projects on a statewide basis have produced projects, (1) of higher quality, (2) more exemplary and innovative in content and services, (3) more in accord with the educational needs of the States, and (4) involving wiser use of Federal funds.

In view of this experience, the council urges that title III be amended to authorize the use of State plans for its future administration. Such plans should be developed according to criteria established by the U.S. Office of Education, in cooperation with the State departments of education. Within the requirements of these criteria, the State education agencies should be authorized to evaluate and approve title III projects proposed by local educational agencies.

It is imperative that all State education agencies actively coordinate the administration of title III with reference to their potential or existing local and regional educational service units. With such coordination, exercised in full cooperation with the vast reservoir of leadership in local education, agencies, many conditions that now restrict general educational improvement can be removed.

(II) Federal funds for strengthening State departments of education under title V of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965

State departments of education throughout the country have been called upon by the Congress to assume extensive administrative and leadership responsibilities in connection with Federal and State financing of education. These departments have been assisted by the provisions of ESEA title V in meeting these responsibilities, which are increasingly important and difficult.

We call upon Congress to increase title V appropriations for fiscal year 1968 to a level at or near the $50 million authorized, and to extend title V for not less than 3 years, with authorizations and appropriations of not less than $50 million annually.

We call on Congress and the administration to find ways to make timely and definite appropriations for educational programs financially supported by the Federal Government. Failure to do so has proved to be costly in terms of employment of competent personnel in State and local education agencies, in organization, effectiveness, evaluation and reporting of programs, and in higher financial outlays caused by delays and uncertainty.

(III) Federal administration of educational programs

The Council reaffirms its position that local, State, and Federal educational programs should be administered in the educational agencies of these respective levels of government. We have been pleased by the recent action of the Congress in placing important programs for adults and handicapped children in these agencies. We urge that additional federally supported programs, such as driver training and early childhood training, also be transferred to Federal, State, and local educational agencies.

3. Department of Elementary School Principals (National Education Association)

The Department of Elementary School Principals is an affiliate of the National Education Association. This department has approximately 24,000 members. The membership is composed primarily of principals of public elementary schools and includes principals of private and church related schools, university professors, supervisors of instruction, and directors of curriculum. Each year the department holds an annual meeting and during this meeting resolutions are considered. The following resolution was adopted by the department in 1967:

Federal responsibility for education

The Department of Elementary School Principals, NEA, has long endorsed the concept of Federal responsibility for broad financial support of public edu-

> cation. During recent years, we have witnessed a dramatic acceleration and change in both the amount and kinds of Federal resources provided for public education. The department appreciates the active and imaginative efforts that have been made recently to expand Federal financial aid to education. It urges Congress to enact further legislation providing for substantial general rather than categorical financial support. This support should be available with minimum limitations on the nature of its use and with maximum local control.
>
> The department further believes that Congress should accept the responsibility for appropriating the funds necessary to implement the programs authorized by the Federal Government, including adequate financial support for administering these programs at the local school level.

4. National Association of Secondary School Principals

The National Association of Secondary School Principals has a current membership of 34,270 junior and senior high school principals; officials of local school systems, State departments of education, and the U.S. Office of Education; and university professors and citizens concerned with the problems of secondary education. Although the more populous States predominate in the membership, all the States are represented, as well as the provinces of Canada and 52 other countries.

The association does not usually adopt resolutions at its annual conventions. Following is an excerpt from a letter received by the writer of this report from the executive secretary of the association dated October 26, 1967:

> The NASSP has for many years supported the principle of Federal support to the public schools. We are concerned with the logical extent of categorical aid, and the possibility of more general support. We are hopeful that a formula can be found which will result in basic Federal general support to public schools in every State for such essentials as teacher salaries and school construction, without major reductions in programs of categorical aid. We are in favor of extending the benefits of both categorical and general aid to private secondary schools to the extent consistent with our constitutional separation of church and state. We have supported in principle, and continue to applaud, the policies embodied in the aid to federally impacted districts (Public Law 874 and Public Law 815), the NDEA, and the more recent enactments of the 89th Congress.
>
> * * * * * * *
>
> It is our position in general that the Office of Education should remain, as it has always been, a clearing house for information and a conduit for Federal aid in accordance with Federal law. We tend to question the advisability of increasing the operational functions of the USOE, in the conviction that the USOE should not itself become an educational institution carrying on research, conducting courses, or training teachers. These functions should be left to the State education agencies and the universities, both public and private.* * *

5. National Association of State Boards of Education

The National Association of State Boards of Education was formed in 1959. Its current membership includes State boards of education from 48 States and territorial boards from two territories.

Following are excerpts from resolutions adopted at the 1967 conference of the association held in New York City on September 26, 1967:

> *Be it resolved:*
>
> Section 1. That the National Association of State Boards of Education strongly urges the Congress of the United States, the President of the United States, the Bureau of the Budget, the U.S. Office of Education to change practices and procedures relative to making appropriations for educational programs, so that com-

plete knowledge and full assurance of the extent of funds available to conduct an educational program is provided at a time prior to the date when the agency conducting the program must by law adopt a budget for the fiscal year.

6. NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE DIRECTORS OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION (NASDVE)

This is an association of the 50 State directors of vocational education and of the directors of vocational education for Guam, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

Following is an excerpt from a position statement on a national manpower policy adopted by the NASDVE on May 11, 1967:

> Rapid technological changes and the population explosion have created the the need to establish a manpower policy as it relates to occupational training.
>
> The public school system in the various States and communities is recognized by the citizens of the United States as the public agency responsible for conducting education and training for youth and adults. Education and training should be a cooperative undertaking involving leadership and financial support at Federal, State, and local levels.
>
> The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, through the Office of Education, has for many years been the agency at the national level which is directly responsible for administering Federal funds and programs provided by the Congress for the occupational training of youth and adults in the development of knowledge and skills for the Nation's work force.
>
> There is a growing tendency toward the establishment of a dual system of occupational training whereby other agencies of the Federal Government are attempting to conduct such training outside of the Federal-State-local educational structure which cannot be justified either in terms of cost or effectiveness.
>
> Unnecessary duplication in publicly supported training programs where Federal funds from various sources are administered by different public agencies results in a waste of the taxpayer's money.
>
> We seek for maximum excellence in vocational training and believe that through education and long years of experience, professional public school personnel are best qualified to conduct such training efficiently and effectively.

7. NATIONAL SCHOOL BOARDS ASSOCIATION

The National School Boards Association (NSBA) is a national organization of State school boards associations. The membership of the NSBA is limited to the 50 State school boards associations, plus two additional organizational members—the school boards of the District of Columbia and of the Virgin Islands. (Local school boards are eligible for membership in their respective State school boards associations.) The major policymaking body of the NSBA is its delegates assembly. Following are excerpts from resolutions adopted by the assembly at Portland, Oreg., April 22 to 25, 1967:

> (1) *Federal aid for public school construction.*—The National School Boards Association believes that the primary responsibility for the construction of public school facilities lies with the States and local school districts; however, since local school construction needs in many parts of the country exceed available financial resources, the Association recommends that Federal funds be extended to aid in the cooperative financing of such construction, remodeling, and renovation. Such funds should be allocated to each State in amounts determined by a formula based on the relative needs for these facilities and upon criteria defining the degree of local district effort necessary to qualify for these funds. Consistent with State law, title to the facilities should be held by the local public school districts.
>
> (2) *Judicial determination of Federal aid to private schools.*—The National School Boards Association has serious concern about the uncertainties of utilizing public funds for nonpublic school purposes. NSBA therefore strongly urges Con-

gress to establish the means whereby the constitutional question of utilizing public funds for nonpublic educational programs can be resolved.

(3) *Federally affected areas legislation.*—The National School Boards Association recommends that the Public Laws 815 and 874 programs be continued on a permanent basis and that the newly eligible school districts can be funded. The association further recommends that the eligibility requirements of these two programs be expanded to include children of families residing within federally aided, tax-exempt housing projects.

(4) *Teachers for educationally deprived children.*—The National School Boards Association is deeply concerned with the great problems of educationally deprived children. It urges colleges and universities and Federal, State, and local educational agencies to take all feasible steps to accomplish such objectives as providing student loans for prospective teachers of these children, making available special teacher training programs in institutions of higher learning, and offering suitable inducements to attract prospective teachers of educationally deprived children.

(5) *National Teacher Corps.*—The National Teacher Corps is one experimental method for helping to alleviate the great shortage of competent personnel for teaching educationally deprived children. As such the National School Boards Association recommends that the program be continued on a pilot basis.

(6) *Greater State discretion in use of title V funds.*—Each State department of education should be permitted more discretion in using title V funds for such purposes as studying and evaluating programs initiated by the department, conducting pilot programs in cooperation with local school districts, and strengthening local school board operations.

(7) *Timing of Federal payments to local school districts.*—One of the most crucial problems resulting from the increased participation of the Federal Government in the financing of education is the incompatibility of the Federal fiscal year and the school year as it affects planning and financing of school programs. The problem results primarily from the fact that Federal funds become available beyond the time when planning for their use can be effective. The National School Boards Association proposes that Congress study this problem and adopt a method which would provide local school districts with the information on available funds at a time when they can use it most effectively.

(8) *U.S. Office of Education—Regional offices.*—The National School Boards Association recommends that there be a clear delineation of the channels of communication, the decisionmaking authority, and the appeals procedure as they pertain to relationships between and among the U.S. Office of Education, its regional offices, the State departments of education, and local boards of education. NSBA further recommends that, wherever possible, educational functions and authority be vested in State departments of education.

* * * * * * *

(10) *Maintenance of effort.*—Federal funds intended to encourage innovative programs should not be denied to local and State educational agencies for the improvement and continuation of such programs which may have been developed prior to the enactment of such legislation.

(11) *Demonstration Cities Act of 1966.*—The National School Boards Association encourages regulations in the Demonstration Cities Act of 1966 which would provide methods by which the environment and education of children can be substantially improved and the means to include local school boards as active participants in the planning and implementation of such programs.

(12) *Reimbursement for local planning costs.*—The National School Boards Association recommends the inclusion within all Federal legislation and administrative regulations of provisions to insure that the planning costs incurred by local school districts be included as a reimbursable cost in the administration of such programs.

(13) *Extension of the years of education.*— * * * (C) The National School Boards Association recommends the transfer of Headstart programs from the Office of Economic Opportunity to the Office of Education to alleviate fragmentation to the total educational effort.

* * * * * * *

(16) *Guidelines and regulations.*—The National School Boards Association believes that policies and guideline statements for school desegregation should be in keeping with the intent and provisions of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and should be uniformly applicable throughout the Nation.

(17) *Federal aid to education.*—The National School Boards Association reaffirms its support of the principle that Federal funds for public educational purposes should include funds in the form of general aid, administered without Federal control, through the U.S. Office of Education and the appropriate State agency in accordance with State policy. The National School Boards Association supports the passage of legislation to the extent that it embodies these principles. NSBA recommends that the Congress provide for a study of existing and proposed legislation so that the will of Congress can be reached in an orderly manner and without creating added difficulties for local school districts. It further recommends that legislation adopted as a result of such study be designed so as to encourage and allow long-range local planning, as well as provide for an orderly implementation of any modifications. The full resources of the National School Boards Association are offered to cooperate in this study.

D. NATIONAL POLITICAL PARTIES

1. Democratic Party

The 1964 Democratic Party platform includes the following statements relating to education and training:[2]

> There can be full freedom only when all of our people have opportunity for education to the full extent of their ability to learn, followed by the opportunity to employ their learning in the creation of something of value to themselves and to the Nation.
>
> THE INDIVIDUAL
>
> Our task is to make the national purpose serve the human purpose: that every person shall have the opportunity to become all that he or she is capable of becoming.
>
> We belive that knowledge is essential to individual freedom and to the conduct of a free society. We believe that education is the surest and most profitable investment a nation can make.
>
> Regardless of family financial status, therefore, education should be open to every boy or girl in America up to the highest level which he or she is able to master.
>
> In an economy which will offer fewer and fewer places for the unskilled, there must be a wide variety of educational opportunities so that every young American, on leaving school, will have acquired the training to take a useful and rewarding place in our society.
>
> It is increasingly clear that more of our educational resources must be directed to preschool training as well as to junior college, college, and post-graduate study.
>
> The demands in the already inadequate sources of State and local revenues place a serious limitation on education. New methods of financial aid must be explored, including the channeling of federally collected revenues to all levels of education, and, to the extent permitted by the Constitution, to all schools. Only in this way can our educational programs achieve excellence throughout the Nation, a goal that must be achieved without interfering with local control and direction of education.
>
> In order to insure that all students who can meet the requirements for college entrance can continue their education, we propose an expanded program of public scholarships, guaranteed loans, and work-study grants.
>
> We shall develop the potential of the Armed Forces for training young men who might otherwise be rejected for military service because their work skills are underdeveloped.
>
> * * * * * * *
>
> We must develop fully our most precious resource—our manpower. Training and retraining programs must be expanded. A broad-gauge manpower program must be developed which will not only satisfy the needs of the economy but will also give work its maximum meaning in the pattern of human life. * * *

---

[2] The text of the 1968 platform, which was not available at the time of preparation of this chapter, appears in the appendix.

2. Republican Party

The 1964 Republican Party platform includes the following statements relating to education and training.[3]

TO STAY FREE

The shape of the future is our paramount concern. Much of today's moral decline and drift—much of the prevailing preoccupation with physical and material comforts of life—much of today's crass political appeals to the appetites of the citizenry—can be traced to a leadership grown demagogic and materialistic through indifference to national ideals founded in devoutly held religious faith. The Republican Party seeks not to renounce this heritage of faith and high purpose; rather, we are determined to reaffirm and reapply it. So doing, these will be our guides:

1. Every person has the right to govern himself, to fix his own goals, and to make his own way with a minimum of governmental interference.
2. It is for Government to foster and maintain an environment of freedom encouraging every individual to develop to the fullest his God-given powers of mind, heart, and body; and, beyond this, Government should undertake only needful things, rightly of public concern, which the citizen cannot himself accomplish.

We Republicans hold that these two principles must regain their primacy in our Government's relations, not only with the American people, but also with nations and peoples everywhere in the world.

* * * * * * *

4. It is a high mission of Government to help assure equal opportunity for all, affording every citizen an equal chance at the starting line but never determining who is to win or lose. But Government must also reflect the Nation's compassionate concern for those who are unable, through no fault of their own, to provide adequately for themselves.

* * * * * * *

FAILURES AT HOME

* * * * * * *

This administration has failed to apply Republican-initiated retraining programs where most needed, particularly where they could afford new economic opportunities to Negro citizens. It has preferred, instead, divisive political proposals.

* * * * * * *

It has failed to perform its responsibility under Republican amendments to the Manpower Training Act. It has neglected, for example, the basic requirement of developing a dictionary of labor skills which are locally, regionally, and nationally in short supply, even though many thousands of jobs are unfilled today for lack of qualified applicants.

* * * * * * *

It has resisted personal income tax credits for education, always preferring the route leading to Federal control over our schools. Some leading Democrats have even campaigned politically in favor of such tax credits while voting against them in Congress.

Contrary to the intent of the Manpower Training Act, it has sought to extend Department of Labor influence over vocational education.

* * * * * * *

FAITH IN THE INDIVIDUAL

1. We Republicans shall first rely on the individual's right and capacity to advance his own economic well-being, to control the fruits of his efforts and to plan his own and his family's future; and, where government is rightly involved, we shall assist the individual in surmounting urgent problems beyond his own power and responsibility to control. For instance, we pledge—

---

[3] The text of the 1968 platform, which was not available at the time of preparation of this chapter, appears in the appendix.

> enlargement of employment opportunities for urban and rural citizens, with emphasis on training programs to equip them with needed skills; improved job information and placement services; and research and extension services channeled toward helping rural people improve their opportunities;
>
> * * * * * * *
>
> tax credit for those burdened by the expenses of a college education; vocational rehabilitation, through cooperation between government—Federal and State—and industry, for the mentally and physically handicapped, the chronically unemployed, and the poverty stricken;
>
> * * * * * *
>
> In furtherance of our faith in the individual, we also pledge the maximu straint of Federal intrusions into matters more productively left to the vidual. For instance, we pledge—
>
> * * * * * * *
>
> to continue the advancement of education on all levels, through such p grams as selective aid to higher education, strengthen State and local t resources, including tax credits for college education, while resisting Democratic efforts which endanger local control of schools;
>
> to help assure equal opportunity and a good education for all, while opposing federally sponsored "inverse discrimination," whether by the shifting of jobs, or the abandonment of neighborhood schools, for reasons of race;
>
> * * * * * * *
>
> In furtherance of our faith in limited, frugal, and efficient government we also pledge—
>
> credit against Federal taxes for specified State and local taxes paid, and a transfer to the States of excise and other Federal tax resources, to reinforce the fiscal strength of State and local governments so that they may better meet rising school costs and other pressing urban and suburban problems such as transportation, housing, water systems, and juvenile delinquency;
>
> * * * * * * *
>
> critical reexamination and major overhaul of all Federal grant-in-aid programs with a view to channeling such programs through the States, discontinuing those no longer required, and adjusting others in a determined effort to restore the unique valance and creative energy of the traditional American system of government.

E. ORGANIZED LABOR

1. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations

The AFL-CIO is a voluntary association of 127 national and international trade unions, having approximately 14,500,000 dues-paying members. Its structure includes central labor bodies in every State and in 800 communities, comprising geographical groups of local unions.

In addition to the objectives ordinarily associated with the labor movement, the constitution of the AFL-CIO, in article II, includes among its objects and principles the following:

> To secure legislation which will safeguard and promote * * * the security and welfare of all the people.

Basic policy decisions of the AFL-CIO are decided at its biennial conventions, attended by delegates from each affiliate, and are supplemented between conventions by actions of the general board, comprising representatives of each national and international union, and of the executive council, elected at each convention.

Following are excerpts—relating to Federal policies—from the resolutions on education adopted at the national convention of the AFL-CIO at Bal Harbour, Fla., December 7-12, 1967.

3

Among the education bills which have been passed by Congress with the active support of the AFL–CIO, have been the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the Higher Education Act, the Vocational Education Act, the "Cold War" GI bill, and of course many others.

These new Federal programs, taken together, constitute an important step forward in American education. Yet, the evidence clearly indicates that the present level of Federal support is not commensurate with the demands of the situation. Despite the growth of American education, staggering problems yet remain.

* * * * * * *

* * * The Headstart concept needs to be more than a few weeks of intensive summertime activity; it must become a regular part of the year-round school program. To do this will require more teachers, new classrooms, and substantially increased funds.

* * * * * * *

The Teacher Corps with its turbulent legislative history has demonstrated that able young Americans will step forward to serve in the Nation's poverty schools if they are offered imaginative training and support. The Corps has already made a significant contribution to ghetto school education which has enabled school systems and local universities to provide a practical demonstration of new methods in instruction and teacher training. We in the AFL–CIO hail these efforts. In this connection we urge the expansion of teacher training programs to effectively upgrade the skills of those teachers serving in ghetto school areas.

* * * * * * *

* * * Federal scholarships and tuition-free publicly supported education must be available to every young person in such alternative institutions as colleges and universities, community colleges, and technical institutes.

* * * * * * *

All of the programs require money which is not now being invested in education. These funds must, in the largest part, come from the Federal Government which alone has the taxing power to meet the needs. * * * Therefore, be it

Resolved; That the AFL–CIO support a program of full Federal partnership in the financing of education at all levels from prekindergarten programs through adult education. Be it further

Resolved, That the AFL–CIO support the significant increase of present levels of Federal expenditure in order to make possible a massive national effort to provide quality education for all children and young persons, wherever they may live, whatever their race or national background, whatever their family income. Only through such efforts can we realize our goals and objectives to provide the equal opportunity for all Americans to acquire the necessary tools for a better life.

* * * * * * *

The AFL–CIO believes that the objectives of the Vocational Education Act of 1963 can be achieved only when the majority of our young people are prepared for work while in school. Such preparation must be substantially broadened to include a family of occupations in order to meet the requirements of our rapidly changing technology. Also, such preparation must be in the context of a unified system of general and occupational education from the elementary school through junior college.

* * * * * * *

A national advisory committee was established under the act as were State advisory committees composed of business, labor, and public members. Labor members have had the opportunity to confer among themselves to examine problems in depth at special conferences, jointly sponsored by the AFL–CIO Department of Education, U.S. Office of Education, and the School of Labor and Industrial Relations at Michigan State University. We urge the expansion of this effort in the future to cover all committees throughout the country. These meetings are of great value toward the maintenance of a clear perspective of the future needs of vocational education. In view of the foregoing, we in the AFL–CIO again draw attention to what we consider key objectives in American education—to equip our young people with all the skills basic to obtain and keep jobs that are in demand on today's labor market and to educating our young workers to become good citizens who find great satisfaction in their occupations and who will be proud of their accomplishments and their contributions to society. Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the organized labor movement press forward for the expansion of a unified occupational training system in our public schools and to increase the number of occupations traditionally covered in this field, and be it further

Resolved, That the AFL-CIO and its affiliates continue their efforts to urge the Congress to appropriate adequate funds to move ahead with this important program.

F. FARMERS ORGANIZATIONS

1. American Farm Bureau Federation

According to information obtained from the American Farm Bureau Federation it represents 1,703,908 paid-up member families in 49 States and Puerto Rico, and is the largest general farm organization in the United States. The Farm Bureau is a voluntary, nongovernmental organization wholly controlled by its members. It is financed by membership dues. It is organized to provide a means by which farmers can work together toward the goals upon which they agree. It represents farmers from every part of the country, producers of every kind of farm commodity.

The following policies relating to Federal activities in education were adopted at the 48th Annual Convention of the American Farm Bureau Federation, December 8, 1966:

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS

We continue to oppose Federal grants for elementary and secondary schools. We believe this is a responsibility of State and local governments. We urge all Farm Bureaus to work vigorously to meet present and future needs for financing elementary and secondary education from State and local funds.

* * * * * * *

Our educational system has been developed and guided by the citizens in our school districts. This system must prevail if we are to maintain the quality of education vital to the needs of a free people.

* * * * * * *

FINANCING HIGHER EDUCATION

The administration and basic financing of higher education are quite properly a State, local, and private responsibility. Any further expansion of supplemental Federal assistance should be based on adequate study and demonstrated need. We favor increased deductions or tax credits to individuals to help defray the costs of higher education.

* * * * * * *

VOCATIONAL TRAINING

We urge that vocational training in agriculture, related industries, and home economics be given adequate emphasis and financed according to present practices. We recommend that vocational education departments reevaluate their courses of training to meet present-day needs. State and local groups should retain primary responsibility for vocational programs.

2. National Farmers Union

National Farmers Union is a general farm organization of a quarter of a million farm families scattered throughout the United States, but concentrated in the heart of family farm commercial agriculture in the United States.

Throughout its 65-year history, it has been predominantly composed of independent farmer-owner operators earning their living from farming.

The official policy statement adopted by delegates to the annual convention of the National Farmers Union in Oklahoma City, Okla., on March 12–15, 1967, contains the following sections regarding the Federal role in education:

EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL OPPORTUNITIES

Every American child is entitled to as much education as he wants and can usefully absorb.

This is a basic principle. It is basic to the American way of life and it is basic to the future of the United States as a Nation.

Great strides were taken by the previous Congress, but there are further strides to be taken if this principle is to become a reality. They include: (1) Substantial Federal aid to schools which serve large numbers of culturally disadvantaged children from low-income areas. (2) Expanded opportunity for vocational training in agriculture and home economics at the high school level and other skills related to job opportunity, including work-study programs. (2) Further development, through assistance of the Federal Government, to promote area vocational-technical schools for out-of-school youth. (4) To expand the comprehensive assistance embracing scholarships, expanded student loans, and work-study opportunities for junior college and college students.

We urge the appropriation of additional Federal funds to further the establishment and growth of community junior colleges to provide a minimum of 14 years of free education. Such colleges should be within commuting distance of any student.

The Nation, as well as the States, counties, and local districts should be used as a base for educational support.

EQUAL OPPORTUNITY

Federal aid should be provided for the construction of all public educational facilities where local or State funds are not available to insure this opportunity. All adults should have an opportunity to participate throughout life in meaningful educational programs.

Urban, city, and rural people alike have need for a broad-based educational and cultural program which the Extension Service should develop in cooperation with all departments of land-grant colleges and universities. Transformation of the Extension Service in some areas to serve these needs should be extended to other areas. As progress is made toward the goal, the feasibility of merging, at national and State levels, general and extension service programs should be thoroughly explored as the means to better coordination of adult educational programs.

We commend those State and Federal officials who have taken action to prevent State agricultural extension services from engaging in any activity which discriminates against any private farm organization. We will oppose allocation of Federal funds to any State where a private group dominates and controls the Extension Service through financial aid or other association which is self-serving for the group and is discriminatory to other organizations.

We favor "cabinet status" for education. In the current reorganization of various branches of education, and looking toward autonomy in the executive branch for education, we oppose any effort to lower the status of vocational agriculture.

EDUCATIONAL TV

We support Federal aid for a nationwide educational television network.

LOCAL CONTROL

All Federal and State aid for elementary, secondary, college and graduate level education, and adult education should be completely safeguarded to preserve local control.

COLLEGES

Increased Federal appropriations should be provided for grants-in-aid and loans to State land-grant and other colleges and to college students. Federal aids should be designed and administered in a way which will encourage the reduction of tuition or educational costs for college students.

The operations of the Federal-State Employment Service should be expanded and improved, particularly in rural areas, and we urge that needed retraining, including building trade skills, be accelerated under the Manpower Training and Development Act and economic opportunity program for both farm youth and adults.

3. National Grange

The National Grange is a farm fraternity over 100 years old, which has as its basic principle building and fostering the welfare of the farm family. Total membership of the National Grange, scattered through 38 States, numbers about 750,000 persons. In carrying out its principal purpose of developing and preserving the farm home, the Grange is concerned with community service, legislation, cooperative activities, and the public welfare generally.

The following resolution concerning the Federal role in education was adopted by the National Grange in convention at Syracuse, N.Y., November 13–22, 1967.

> We not only need to educate our young people in the required curriculum, but we should encourage them to strengthen their values by recognizing and sustaining a reverence toward a Supreme Being, and by having respect for law and order which seems to be lacking in these times of "free behavior." Therefore, the Grange believes that the "Pledge to our Flag" should be incorporated into the daily schedule in all schools—private, parochial, and public—and we will continue to work for a constitutional amendment permitting voluntary, nonsectarian, and nondenominational prayer and Bible reading in our public schools.

* * * * * * *

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

> We emphasize the importance and desirability of local control over our public school systems.
>
> While we believe we need safe public school buildings, we recommend that more emphasis be placed upon the educational and scholastic standards in our schools.
>
> The Grange opposes any cutback in Federal funds under Public Law 874 inasmuch as any such cutback would place undue and unfair tax burdens on school districts in areas of Federal installations by requring them to financially support the education of federally connected children.
>
> We support the headstart program but feel it should be reviewed and possibly revised to benefit those for whom it is intended.
>
> We favor continuation of the school lunch and milk programs, but feel that such costs should not be charged against the Department of Agriculture budget and that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare should assume such costs of the programs. We favor legislation allowing ice cream to be used and included in the reimbursable cost of the class A school lunch program.

G. INDUSTRIAL AND TRADE ORGANIZATIONS

1. Chamber of Commerce of the United States

The Chamber of Commerce of the United States is a national federation of businessmen, corporations, and voluntary organizations of business and professional men. Its purpose is to improve and protect the private business system, to keep the economy dynamic and expanding, and to support a sound relationship among Federal, State, and local governments

The national chamber has about 3,700 organization members (local and State chambers of commerce, and trade and professional associations) and 33,000 business members (firms, corporations, and individuals). The underlying membership of the national chamber—the combined membership of its affiliated organizations—is approximately 5 million business and professional men.

Policy declarations are developed in committees and referred to the board of directors, with the policy commitee then recommending them for consideration by the annual meeting of the national chamber. The size of the affiliated organization member determines the number of votes it may cast on policy proposals.

The following policy dclaration on financing State and local government, adopted by the national chamber in 1967, also applies to educational programs.

> Preservation of our system of constitutional government requires that Congress terminate Federal direction and control over those functions which are the rightful obligation of State and local governments.
>
> Crucial to the ability of State and local governments to perform their rightful functions is the availability of adequate fiscal resources.
>
> Federal grants-in-aid to State and local governments are becoming a major and growing source of revenues to such governments. Proliferation and expansion of grants-in-aid have increased Federal direction and control over wide areas of traditionally State and local government functions.
>
> Every effort should be made to consolidate the vast number of existing conditional Federal grants-in-aid programs.
>
> Alternative approaches to grants-in-aid, such as block grants, credits of State and local taxes against Federal income tax, sharing of Federal revenue, and reductions of Federal income tax rates as a means of providing revenues to the State and local governments should be carefully developed and supported where necessary as substitutes for Federal grants-in-aid.
>
> Any law providing these approaches, however, should contain certain conditions essential to making them effective and in keeping with the concept of State and local government responsibility. The conditions are (1) that these approaches provide incentives for State and local governments to provide adequate tax structures consistent with their needs; (2) that these approaches contain provisions to assure that a reasonable percentage of federally provided funds goes to local governments; (3) that the approaches encourage and help local and State governments to improve their ability to manage and administer public services; and (4) that the approaches encourage local and State governments to provide adequate levels of expenditure for needed public services.

According to information obtained from the national chamber, consistent with the principles set forth in the foregoing and other policy statements, the chamber has taken the following action on recent legislative proposals: (1) Supported the 1967 amendment to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 which would consolidate titles I, II, III, and V into one block grant to the States (the Quie amendment). (2) Supported the 1967 amendment to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 which would transfer from the U.S. Office of Education to the States the responsibility for the approval of local projects under title III (the Green amendment). (3) Supported the requirement that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare not withhold funds from a local educational agency for noncompliance with the provisions of title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 without providing an opportunity for a hearing and arriving at an expressly adverse finding (the 1967 Fountain amendment). (4) Continued support for the proposal by three administrations that the eligibility of school districts under Public Laws 815 and 874 be restricted to those districts actually overburdened with enrollments of Federal workers and suffering from a depletion of tax revenues because of the exemption of Federal property from local taxation. (5) Supported the limitations on the expansion in staffing in the regional offices of the U.S. Office of Education which were included in the 1967 Senate Appropriations Committee report.

2. NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MANUFACTURERS

The National Association of Manufacturers is a national organization of about 14,000 member companies, representing all industries and located throughout the United States. According to information obtained from its national headquarters, the association fosters greater unity among America's manufacturers in working out their common problems, economic and industrial. Through it manufacturers "seek to crystallize their views into policies and programs on current problems." The association provides information services for managers of industry and "serves as their national spokesman." The medium by which this is accomplished consists of 15 policy committees on which about 3,000 representatives of member companies serve. Policy resolutions formulated by these committees, after discussion and debate, are presented to a board of directors of about 180, representing a broad cross section of the association's membership. A two-thirds vote of the board is required for the adoption of any official policy position.

The following policy position of the association concerning Federal aid to education, which has been in effect for several years, was reaffirmed by the board in December 1967.

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

> Education should continue to be the direct responsibility of the States and their citizens, and the Federal Government should not interfere with this responsibility by undertaking broad programs of general aid. Programs of special aid by the Federal Government should be under the direction of the State governments.

H. CHURCHES AND CHURCH-AFFILIATED ORGANIZATIONS

1. AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR JEWISH EDUCATION

The American Association for Jewish Education, established in 1939, is the national parent body for central agencies of Jewish education in 43 cities of the United States embracing more than 90 percent of its Jewish population. The association is a lay organization governed by a board of governors of lay and religious leaders as well as outstanding Jewish educators from all denominational and ideological groups.

The following information was received from the executive director of the American Association for Jewish Education for inclusion in this report:

* * * * * * *

> Our most recent statement of position relative to the Federal role in education was taken on the occasion of congressional consideration of the Federal Aid to Education Act (the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965). * * * You will note that it endorses proposals for Federal aid to general education, while calling them inadequate in quality. The major stress of this position paper is in opposition to those provisions of the act dealing with aid to parochial and private education.

Following is an excerpt from the association's position statement:

* * * * * * *

We believe that it would be injurious to the vitality of the public school and to the communality and independence of education if religious and private schools were to receive governmental aid, and would thus be encouraged to compete with, and ultimately to weaken, the public school system. It is clear that when private school education becomes a public responsibility, however small the initial grant of public aid, then concepts of public and private education become confused. The American school systems would then consist of contending ideological groups, lobbying for increased public subvention. Indoctrination would supplant free inquiry as to the norm in our school system.

* * * * * * *

The character of parochial instruction holds that religion pervades all forms of education, including mathematics, biology, history, and literature. What then shall be taught in the public school? Presumably, vocational subjects and gym. If such a division is agreed upon, (as, indeed, has been the practice in several cities) the community gives its overt approval to ideational control of education by a religious body, and, for itself, accepts responsibility only for the mechanical phases of instruction. If another alternative is chosen, and ideational subjects are also allotted to the public school, then the "consortium" will have to agree as to how these subjects are to be taught in the public school. *Surely such a system not merely invites, but requires the decisive intrusion of religious groups into the curriculum of public education.*

2. AMERICAN LUTHERAN CHURCH

As of December 31, 1966, The American Lutheran Church had a membership of 2,569,150 persons, 4,909 congregations, and 5,760 clergymen. The members are located in 45 States and the District of Columbia.

Nearly 85 percent of the members, however, live in 11 States, including California, Illinois, Iowa, Michigan, Minnesota, North Dakota, Ohio, South Dakota, Texas, Washington, and Wisconsin.

Following is an excerpt from a presently effective statement on "Federal Aid for Church Institutions," which was adopted by the delegates attending the general convention of the American Lutheran Church at Milwaukee, Wis., October 18–24, 1962.

* * * * * * *

We regard Federal loans or grants to church-owned or church-related colleges, hospitals, nursing homes for older people, whether for capital investment or for normal operations, as presenting greater complications for both church and state than do direct aids to persons.

We recognize, nevertheless, that Federal funds have been appropriated and currently are available for colleges, hospitals, nursing homes, and homes for older people. We recognize, too, that institutions of the American Lutheran Church have accepted such funds for expansion of their program and facilities. On the one hand, we feel that the acceptance of governmental loans or grants by institutions of the church may jeopardize their freedom to carry out their distinctive religious functions. On the other hand, we would protest were church-owned and church-related institutions excluded by legislation from Federal programs designed to aid colleges, hospitals, and nursing homes, and homes for older people. In each of these fields we believe that church agencies are contributing greatly to the general welfare. We insist that they should be eligible to participate in any program of governmental assistance in these areas. Whether they do so or not should be their own choice.

* * * * * * *

Controls necessarily accompany assistance in any form from any branch of the Government. Such controls may be explicit in the terms of the grant or the underlying legislation, or it may arise by operation of law since the acceptance of aid may lead to the characterization of the institution as a quasi-governmental agency. Before accepting any such Federal aid the church institution must satisfy itself that its essential character, institutional integrity, and freedom to carry out its objectives will not be jeopardized.

* * * * * * *

It is appropriate for our institutions to enter into contracts for specific services, projects, or programs, but these should not serve to divert the institution from its basic program. Neither should they be permitted to distort or significantly to unbalance the institutional program and objectives.

* * * * * * *

3. AMERICANS UNITED FOR SEPARATION OF CHURCH AND STATE

Americans United is a nonprofit organization dedicated solely to the preservation of religious liberty through the observance of the principle of church-state separation embodied in the first amendment. The organization has a nationwide membership representing every State in the Union, every religious faith, and a wide range of political beliefs. It has more than 100 chapters, study groups, regional offices, and clearinghouses.

A manifesto adopted by the Board of Americans United on November 20, 1947, constitutes the credo of the organization. The manifesto commits Americans United to oppose legislation alloting to church schools any portion of a Federal appropriation for education. In accordance with this manifesto and as an authorized representative of the organization, its associate director gave testimony before the Senate Subcommittee on Education on August 11, 1967, concerning the organization's position, including the following statement:

* * * * * * *

We have, indeed, come face to face with the question as to whether the States are to be permitted any policymaking role at all, or whether they are to be altogether subsumed by the Federal power. To be specific, are the States to be permitted in their laws a tight, strict concept of separation of church and state? Or, will the Federal power simply override and beat down this concept by the sheer weight of its money power, forcing on the States programs and procedures which are specifically forbidden by their laws. To put it another way, shall the States which desire to establish and sustain a single system of public schools serving the entire community have forced on them, instead, the business of planning for and supporting various systems of religious schools as well?

* * * * * * *

If there is concern for State laws and State arrangements in education, and for constitutional provisions, then we would recommend that this legislation be amended with the addition of a disclaimer which would differ from the one which the legislation presently contains. The present law provides that if State officials are stopped by their laws from carrying out the programs of aid to religious schools that the Federal Office of Education will step in and do it anyway and will deduct the amount so expended from that State's allocation. We would recommend that in place of this provision the bill include a disclaimer providing assurance that where a State desire to expend funds only for public schools and is so confined by its constitution and laws, that no Federal aid programs overriding or contravening such provisions be effectuated in such State, and that amounts as would have been available for these programs be allocated, instead, to programs permissible under that State's laws.

* * * * * * *

4. FRIENDS COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL LEGISLATION

The Friends Committee on National Legislation is composed of approximately 200 Friends, two-thirds of whom are officially appointed by 20 of the 26 yearly meetings of the Religious Society of Friends in the United States, by one regional association of Friends, and by nine

Friends organizations or committees. Not more than one-third of the members of the committee can be appointed at large. The committee has stated that it does not, nor can any organization or individual, speak for all Friends. Its statements of legislative policy represent a substantial consensus, although not necessarily unanimity on all points, by a broadly representative group of Friends.

Following is an excerpt from the statement of legislative policy adopted by the committee at its annual meeting in Washington, D.C., January 20–22, 1967.

* * * * * * *

> * * * The Federal Government needs to provide the kinds of incentives that will enable the States to upgrade and expand their programs for children.
>
> We welcome the measures which have been passed to extend educational opportunities to the Nation's young people. Among the needs still inadequately met are oportunities for higher education and technical training, and especially for more doctors and nurses, and for training for overseas service in helping emerging countries solve their problems of education, food, and economic growth.

* * * * * * *

5. General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists

According to the Yearbook of American Churches, 1967, the Seventh-day Adventist denomination is composed of 3,156 churches having a combined membership of 364,000.

The following information was obtained from the secretary of the Department of Education of the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists on December 1, 1967.

> Insofar as the Seventh-day Adventist Church is concerned the stand taken by the organization, as of this date, has been not to approve the acceptance of Government grants to our colleges and universities for operating or capital expenses. We, in our schools, have been permitted to accept research funds for specific projects on a contract basis.

* * * * * * *

6. General Conference of the United Methodist Church

In 1967 the membership of the Methodist Church in the United States was reported by the church as being, in round numbers, 10,250,000. The General Conference of the Methodist Church, which meets every 4 years, is its representative body. It is composed of elected delegates, ministerial and lay, from the entire church membership.

The General Conference of the Methodist Church, meeting in April-May, 1968, adopted the recommendations of a special Study-Commission on Church-Government Relations. The Commission report represents the fruit of nearly 8 years of study by some 18 lay and clerical members of the Methodist Church who were chosen by the various national boards and agencies of the denomination to serve on the Commission.

The Commission report recommends certain standards which, in the opinion of the Commission, ought to be met before Government funds are granted to private (including church-related) educational institutions. However, the report does not rule out Government financial support unconditionally for these institutions.

7. LUTHERAN CHURCH IN AMERICA

In the fall of 1967 the Lutheran Church in America had a membership of 3,279,036 persons. The church has not adopted a resolution specifically concerning the Federal role in education. However, following is an excerpt from a statement concerning the relations between church and state in the United States, adopted by the third biennial convention of the Lutheran Church in America at Kansas City, Mo., June 21–29, 1966.

* * * * * * *

> * * * We advocate the institutional separation and functional interaction of church and state. This position rejects both the absolute separation of church and state and the domination of either one by the other, while seeking a mutually beneficial relationship in which each institution contributes to the common good by remaining true to its own nature and task.

8. LUTHERAN CHURCH—MISSOURI SYNOD

In 1966, the Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod—reported 2,729,897 baptized members and 1,806,187 communicant members (approximately age 13 and up) in the United States. These members were distributed among 5,406 autonomous congregations in the 50 States plus the District of Columbia.

In 1966, congregations of the Synod operated 1,332 elementary schools with an enrollment of 159,216 and 25 high schools with an enrollment of 11,435. In addition, the synod itself operated two theological seminaries, three teachers colleges, one 2-year senior college, and nine junior colleges in the United States.

The following resolution was adopted by the 47th regular convention of the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod in New York City, July 7–14, 1967:

> That Federal aid for children attending nonpublic schools, as authorized by the Congress and defined by the courts, be deemed acceptable so long as it does not interfere with the distinctive purposes for which such schools are maintained; and be it further resolved that synodical and District officials be requested to explore with appropriate Government officials the availability, utilization, and administration of Federal funds on an equitable basis for children attending nonpublic schools, and be it finally resolved that congregations faced with a decision regarding Federal aid for children attending Lutheran schools be urged to consult with appropriate District officials.

9. NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR JEWISH EDUCATION

The National Council for Jewish Education is the overall professional body of Jewish educators composed of heads of community educational agencies and institutions, principals of afternoon and all-day schools, institutions in Jewish teacher-training schools, and men and women in related disciplines of all Jewish ideological groupings.

At the time of this writing the latest expressed position of the Council concerning the Federal role in education is that contained in the following resolution adopted by the Council on March 31, 1965:

> The National Council for Jewish Education * * * joins with other professional educational organizations, among them the National Education Associa-

tion, American Association of School Administrators, and the American Federation of Teachers, in supporting the 1965 education bill recommended by President Johnson which provides important educational services to culturally deprived children in all schools, public and private, and supplementary educational services and enriched programs of schooling for all children. We urge that in the administration of all phases of the bill, provision be made for maintaining and safeguarding the autonomy of all educational institutions, public and nonpublic.

10. National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States of America

The National Council of Churches is a cooperative agency of 34 Protestant and Orthodox churches in the United States, especially established by these churches in 1950. These 34 churches have a total membership of approximately 42 million persons. According to information obtained from the Council's Department of Educational Development, "whereas the Council does not speak for its member churches, the churches through the Council do speak to one another and to the general public. What is said through the Council is determined altogether by the elected representatives of the churches.

Following are excerpts from a Resolution on Federal Aid to Education adopted by the general board of the National Council of Churches in the United States of America at Portland, Oreg., February 26, 1965.

* * * * * * *

The General Board of the National Council of Churches has repeatedly expressed its support for public education and urged that Federal aid be given to public schools throughout the Nation. All children have a right to share in this aid through attendance at public schools. To the extent compatible with the religion clauses of the first amendment and the sound principle of public control of public funds, those attending private and parochial schools should benefit from this aid.

* * * * * * *

In any program of Federal aid that makes benefits available to children in nonpublic schools, certain safeguards should be designed to make clear that it is children and not schools which receive the benefit, viz.:

1. That benefits intended for all children be determined and administered directly by public agencies responsible to the electorate (whether directly or indirectly);
2. That such benefits intended for all children not be conveyed in such a way that religious institutions acquire property or the services of personnel thereby;
3. That such benefits not be used directly or indirectly for the inculcation of religion or the teaching of sectarian doctrine; and
4. That there be no discrimination by race, religion, class, or national origin in the distribution of such benefits.

Since these distinctions are subtle, and the principles at stake important, adequate provision for judicial review should be included in any legislation on this subject.

11. Southern Baptist Convention

According to the Yearbook of American Churches, 1967, the Southern Baptist Convention in that year had 10,770,573 members, in 33,774 churches, located in 29 States and the District of Columbia.

Relative to Federal aid to education the Southern Baptist Convention adopted the following resolution in Miami, Fla., on June 2, 1967.

Whereas, the Southern Baptist Convention reiterated in 1963 its historic position for separation of church and state in its statement on "The Baptist

Faith and Message" in these words: "Church and state should be separate. The state owes to every church protection and full freedom in the pursuit of its spiritual ends. In providing for such freedom no ecclesiastical group or denomination should be favored by the state more than other * * * the church should not resort to the civil power to carry on its work * * * the state has no right to impose taxes for the support of any form of religion"; and

Whereas, we desire to see all rights and freedoms guaranteed by the Constitution and Bill of Rights secured unto all persons; and

Whereas, an increasingly complex society constantly raises new questions in application of the separation principle: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this 1967 session of the Southern Baptist Convention reaffirm its 1963 declaration for separation of church and state; and be it further

Resolved, That we urge the Congress of the United States to enact legislation which would help clarify responsibility of the judiciary to interpret the meaning of the U.S. Constitution for separation of church and state, including constitutionality of Federal funds in church-sponsored programs; and be it further

Resolved, That we remind all who call themselves Baptists, distinguish carefully the services that are publicly supported from the Christian ministries that should be supported exclusively by the churches and hold to programs that are clearly committed to Christ and His kingdom.

12. United Presbyterian Church in the United States of America

The United Presbyterian Church in the United States of America is composed of 9,002 churches having a combined membership in 1967 of 3,298,583. The general assembly, the highest judicatory of the United Presbyterian Church, meets annually in May. Approximately 850 commissioners are convened from the 188 presbyteries to form the general assembly.

The following resolution currently in effect (fall, 1967) was adopted by the 176th general assembly in May 1964.

The 176th general assembly—

1. Reaffirms its vigorous support of, and commitment to, the American system of public education available to all children;
2. Reaffirms the church's support, in principle, of Federal tax aid to public elementary and secondary school systems;
3. Reaffirms its opposition to the use of tax funds for such direct aid to private or parochial school systems; and
4. Supports in principle a program of Federal aid to public school systems that would encourage shared-time arrangements to permit students enrolled in private or parochial schools to obtain a portion of their education in the public schools.

13. United States Catholic Conference (USCC)

The United States Catholic Conference is an agency of the Catholic bishops of the United States. It operates through an administrative board consisting of 40 elected members. The department of education is one of a number of departments of the conference.

Following are excerpts from a statement by the Very Reverend Monsignor James C. Donohue, director of the Department of Education, USCC, to the Committee on Education and Labor, U.S. House of Representatives, March 15, 1967.

* * * * * * *

First, we support the Teacher Corps program enthusiastically and agree it should be placed in title I of ESEA. We also support the extension of the program for a 3-year period. * * * Bringing the Teacher Corps into the mainstream of the Federal aid program will do much to give it the status and support it needs.

Second, we support amending title V of ESEA to provide for a comprehensive statewide program of systematic planning toward achievement of opportunities for high-quality education for all segments of the population. This comprehensive approach is recognition of the pluralistic character of the American educational community. * * *

Third, we endorse fully the proposal to provide greater educational opportunities for handicapped children. * * *

Fourth, we commend those who would amend the disaster school assistance authority of Public Law 81-815 to authorize construction assistance to the local educational agency where private school facilities are destroyed and will not be replaced. * * *

Fifth, we certainly applaud all the programs and projects in vocational education. We solicit earnest consideration by the committee for inclusion in the law, of provisions comparable to title I, section 205(a)(2) of Public Law 89-10, which under H.R. 6230 would become section 105(a)(2). This would merely assure that the extent consistent with the enrollment in private schools of educationally deprived children residing in the school district receiving a project grant, that provision be made for their participation in these programs.

* * * * * * *

I. WOMEN'S ORGANIZATIONS

1. American Association of University Women

The American Association of University Women is a national association organized in 50 State divisions and 1,616 local branches, with 174,141 members as of June 30, 1967. All members are women graduates of universities and colleges approved for membership by the association. According to its charter the purpose of the association is to unite the alumnae of different institutions for practical educational work, for the collection and publication of statistical and other information concerning education, and in general for the maintenance of high standards of education.

At its 1967 convention the American Association of University Women adopted a Federal legislative program for the 1967-69 biennium which contains a section on the educational policies of the association. It reads:

> AAUW supports expanding educational programs of quality as essential to a democratic society. To provide such programs we support—
>
> 1. Equal opportunity in education;
> 2. Federal assistance to urban and rural programs affecting education, culture, health, and welfare;
> 3. Academic freedom at all levels;
> 4. Cultural, scientific, and educational exchange programs with other nations;
> 5. Increased financial support for the training and education of teachers and faculty;
> 6. Financial aid to institutions of higher education to offset constantly increasing tuition costs to all students, in addition to programs of scholarship aid;
> 7. Federal assistance for construction and equipment of classrooms, libraries, laboratories, and other educational centers at all levels of education;
> 8. Expansion of public libraries and library services.

2. General Federation of Women's Clubs

Founded in 1890, the General Federation of Women's Clubs is an international organization with membership in 60 countries and territories. The membership in the United States consists of 800,000 clubwomen, who pay per capita dues, in 14,000 clubs.

A currently active resolution by the General Federation of Women's Clubs, reaffirmed at its convention in 1965, reads in part as follows:

> Federal aid and assistance:
>
> (1) In making allocations of Federal aid, the formula used should take into account (*a*) established need; (*b*) demonstrated effort to reach a solution with private or State or local resources; (*c*) ability of area in question to pay (per capita wealth); (*d*) the number of people affected.
>
> (2) After a project has been approved, allocation made, and funds provided, administration and control of projects using Federal aid and having local and State application should be confined to financial accounting and compliance with the terms of the contract.
>
> (3) In order to increase local and State self-sufficiency and decrease need for supplementary Federal aid, taxing power in certain suitable fields should be left to, or returned to, the several States.

J. EDUCATIONAL ASSOCIATIONS

1. American Association for Health, Physical Education & Recreation

Founded in 1885, the American Association for Health, Physical Education & Recreation (AAHPER) is a voluntary, nonprofit organization of nearly 53,000 members. In addition to health educators, physical educators, and recreation leaders, membership includes school nurses, dance educators, athletic coaches, and outdoor education personnel. The representative assembly of approximately 350 members is the governing body of the association charged with passing resolutions, making changes in the constitution and bylaws, and electing board members other than district representatives.

In 1966 the representative assembly passed a resolution—

> That AAHPER pledge to exercise its influence to encourage the incorporation of school health and physical education in the National Defense Education Act.

In 1967 the representative assembly passed the following resolution:

> *Be it resolved*, That members of the AAHPER support the initiation and passage of legislation related to sound programs in physical education and recreation for the mentally retarded and physically handicapped.

2. American Association for Higher Education

The American Association for Higher Education, a self-governing department of the National Education Association, is an organization of some 24,000 members of the academic community, including professors, deans, presidents, graduate students, and other administrators from over 1,600 private and public, large and small institutions of higher education throughout the 50 States and 24 foreign countries. The AAHE is the only national educational organization whose membership is open on an individual basis to administrators and faculty members alike, without concern as to rank or discipline.

According to information obtained from the national headquarters of the Association, at the time of this writing the most recent resolutions it has adopted concerning the Federal role in education were those passed by its Conference in Chicago, March 3 to 6, 1963, as follows:

> *12. A Comprehensive Approach.*—That increased support for higher education must be forthcoming at all levels of government: local, State, and National. This Conference adds its voice to the growing number of educational organizations

endorsing in principle "The National Education Improvement Act of 1963" (H.R. 3000 and S. 580), a comprehensive approach for the support of education. Participants at this Conference are especially gratified, of course, by the objectives, specific provisions, and order of magnitude of those sections or titles of the bill which will strengthen higher education, both public and private. This bill represents a level of creative imagination, and at least the beginnings of an effort, which are appropriate to the need.

13. Related Programs.—That, also worthy of endorsement, are those related pieces of Federal legislation which provide support funds to:

(*a*) Continuing Federal programs in the sciences such as those of the Atomic Energy Commission, the National Science Foundation, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the National Institutes of Health, and others which relate closely to education.

(*b*) Loans for college housing.

(*c*) Proposed new programs for construction of teaching facilities in health-related professions (H.R. 12) and for promoting the national interest in the arts and cultural interchanges with other countries (H. Res. 68).

14. Extended Private Support.—That the Federal tax structure assist the flow of private funds to higher education. This continued and indeed increasing flow of private funds into higher education is necessary both to maintain necessary levels of total support for higher education and to preserve the range and diversity of educational opportunity. Toward such ends, the Conference urges that the Federal tax structure, especially the personal net income tax, continue to encourage the flow of private giving.

3. American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education

The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education is a national, voluntary association devoted to the improvement of teacher education. Its more than 774 collegiate members include all types of 4-year collegiate institutions—private, State, and municipal, large and small, located in every State and in Puerto Rico. Collectively AACTE member colleges and universities prepare more than 90 percent of American teachers.

On February 18, 1967, the executive committee of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education passed a resolution that the association:

1. Endorse the concept of the Teacher Corps as a means of enabling teacher education institutions, in cooperation with local school systems, to explore and develop new approaches to the preparation of teachers for the culturally disadvantaged.
2. Recommend careful on-going evaluation of the various programs of the Teacher Corps.
3. Urge adequate financing by the Congress as well as early action to provide sufficient leadtime for development of programs and recruitment of participants.
4. Encourage member institutions to indicate their interest in the concept of the Teacher Corps to members of the Congress.

4. American Association of Junior Colleges

The American Association of Junior Colleges, founded in 1920, includes more than 700 public and private junior and community colleges located in all 50 States. These colleges enroll the great majority of all 2-year college students. Total enrollment is estimated as of October 1967 at about 1,650,000 students.

The following information was received by letter from the Association's director of governmental relations for inclusion in this report:

The board of directors of the American Association of Junior Colleges and its commission on legislation have taken positions on many issues affecting the

Federal Government and higher education in the past few years. No short policy statement can encompass all of these statements, but special attention has been given to the following:

1. Inclusion of public and private 2-year colleges in all relevant programs which affect higher education.
2. Elimination of statutory or administrative barriers which make it difficult or impossible for some junior colleges to participate in some Federal programs such as the Vocational Education Act and Nurse Training Act.
3. An adequate level of financial support for present Federal aid programs.
4. Special emphasis in 1967–68 on the Education Professions Development Act, related to the great need for more and better junior college teachers.
5. Requests that the Federal Government move as rapidly as possible toward a program of general aid or institutional support for higher education, to provide some Federal support to help meet the rising operating costs of undergraduate instruction. The present Federal emphasis on support of research and graduate instruction has meant that almost no support goes toward the vital work of teaching at the undergraduate level—the principal mission of all undergraduate colleges, 2-year and 4-year.

5. American Association of University Professors

The American Association of University Professors is an organization of public and private college and university teachers and research scholars in all academic disciplines, whose purpose is to advance the standards, ideals, and welfare of the academic profession and therefore of higher education. The membership of the association on January 1, 1967, was 81,040 persons organized in 1,040 chapters and 48 State and metropolitan conferences.

The following statement was received from the general secretary of the association for inclusion in this report:

> At its annual meetings the association has adopted resolutions favoring and opposing Federal educational policies and programs. Its support over the years of the Federal civil rights program, locally within institutions and nationally, is a matter of record. It has also endorsed Federal attempts to equalize educational opportunities by subsidizing education in general and by assisting students, professors, and institutions by loans, grants, and fellowships. It is concerned about professorial participation in federally sponsored research, fellowships, and teaching at home and abroad. It endorses Federal project grants that invite professorial initiative as well as institutional grants that encourage institutional autonomy and continuity.
>
> The association supports the Federal Government's desire to increase opportunities in higher education by massive support of emergent institutions. At the same time the association urges that such support foster a high quality of professional life. Faculties at many emergent institutions do not enjoy the responsibilities and rights that are customary in higher education. In such an atmosphere, genuine education for democracy, a major objective of the Federal Government, is obstructed.

6. American Council on Education

The American Council on Education, founded in 1918, is a council of national and regional education associations and institutions of higher education. The members and affiliates of the council, as of June 21, 1967, were as follows: 196 national and regional associations and organizations, 1,273 institutions of higher education, and 50 affiliated institutions and organizations. Associated organization members include State departments of education, city school systems and private school systems. Among the affiliates are secondary schools, libraries, educational departments of business and industrial companies, and educational fraternities and societies.

The following information has been supplied by the executive secretary of the council for inclusion in this report:

> The council has long advocated and supported Federal financial assistance for the construction of college classrooms, laboratories, libraries, and dormitories; aid to needy students; fellowships to prepare teachers for the colleges; and for upgrading the quality of instruction.
>
> It has supported such landmark legislation as the college housing program, the National Defense Education Act, the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963, the Higher Education Act of 1965, and the Education Professions Development Act of 1967. The council also has endorsed the various programs of the National Science Foundation and Public Health Service to improve education and research in the physical, social, biological, and medical sciences.

At the start of each Congress, the council issues a public statement setting forth its recommendations for legislative and administrative actions by the Federal Government to help strengthen higher education. The 1967 statement, entitled, "The Federal Investment in Higher Education," summarizes the council's position as follows:

> The last five Congresses and three administrations have demonstrated, since the enactment of the National Defense Education Act of 1958, a conviction that the Nation's security, welfare, and continued prosperity depend heavily on its system of higher education. This conviction has led to the investment of increasingly large sums in programs designed to strengthen and expand that system.
>
> Higher education, in turn, has responded in a way never before equaled in any age or in any country to meet the Nation's demands for the education of unprecedented numbers of students, for research in virtually all fields of knowledge and for service in the solution of increasingly complex problems.
>
> It is clear that the Federal Government must continue to depend heavily on higher education to undertake a multitude of tasks. Higher education must, in turn, rely heavily on the Government to provide strong and sustained financial support.

7. AMERICAN FEDERATION OF TEACHERS

The American Federation of Teachers is an organization of classroom teachers at the elementary, secondary, and college levels working for the welfare of teachers and students. Organized in 1916, it is affiliated with the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations. It is comprised of more than 700 locals in most of the States, including Alaska and Hawaii; the Canal Zone; and the Department of Defense Overseas Dependents Schools. The membership exceeds 150,000.

The following information has been obtained from the national headquarters of the American Federation of Teachers for inclusion in this report:

> The annual conventions of the American Federation of Teachers have constantly reaffirmed support for increased Federal aid to education with specific emphasis upon aid for disadvantaged areas.
>
> The policies of the American Federation of Teachers in this regard demand: (a) Federal aid for adequate salaries for classroom teachers at all levels to insure the entry into and retention of highest caliber persons in the teaching profession; (b) sufficient funds for school construction which insures sound building standards and fair labor construction policies; and (c) the establishment of the AFT more effective schools program so successfully inaugurated in New York City's disadvantaged areas and which is definitely being adopted in school systems across the Nation.
>
> The American Federation of Teachers supported the 1954 Supreme Court decision on desegregation of schools with an amicus curiae brief. The 1956 American Federation of Teachers Convention required the integration of all AFT segregated locals and supported the Mississippi and Louisiana freedom school programs.

8. American Library Association

Founded in 1876, the American Library Association is the oldest and largest national library association in the world. It is an organization of libraries, librarians, library trustees, and others interested in libraries and in their contributions to the educational, scientific, economic, social, and cultural needs of society.

The association's position on Federal policies in education is given in the Federal legislative policy of the American Library Association, approved by the ALA council, the association's elected governing body, in January 1967. Some excerpts from it follow:

> Comprehensive Federal aid to public education is needed to support the States and their subdivisions in establishing and maintaining adequate educational services and facilities and in equalizing educational opportunities. * * *
>
> * * * The association supports continued and increased Federal assistance to provide professional library personnel in individual schools, at the school-system level, and at the State level; effective library materials collections and resources; and adequate library facilities in order to stimulate and strengthen the development of school library service necessary to support quality education for all students.
>
> * * * * * * *
>
> The public library is an essential part of our total educational structure and supplements formal education at all levels. The success of the Library Services and Construction Act has demonstrated clearly the value of Federal grants to strengthen State library agencies, to improve public library service in local communities, and to stimulate the creation of stronger systems of public libraries having greater resources.
>
> The association recommends that increased Federal assistance be provided to the States to stimulate, strengthen, and expand public and institutional libraries, the development of systems of libraries, interlibrary cooperation, services to the physically handicapped, public library development, and construction in all areas where library service and facilities are below standard or do not now exist. * * *

9. American Vocational Association

The American Vocational Association (AVA) is a national organization of State vocational associations. Individual members of the State associations are also members of the national organization. The association membership numbers approximately 40,000.

At an annual meeting held each December, the AVA house of delegates, representing the State associations, approves a program of work and adopts resolutions designed to implement that program.

The following summary of the resolutions to the Federal role in education approved by the AVA house of delegates, December 1967, was obtained from the national headquarters of the American Vocational Association for inclusion in this report:

> 1. AVA supports legislation to establish a new Federal agency, a Department of Education and Career Development, to provide leadership and resources so that the schools of the Nation might assume a central role in the preparation for employment of all people in all communities.
>
> 2. Urges Congress to pass legislation to vastly increase support for cooperative part-time programs by providing funds for business and industry for student employment to become an extension of the in-school program.
>
> 3. Supports legislation for aid to large metropolitan areas for vocational school programs, summer use of educational facilities, and permanent programs of vocational instruction for school dropouts and adults.
>
> 4. Recognizes the need for legislation concerning vocational education and training to be coordinated at the State level through a single State agency designated by State legislation for this purpose.

5. Urges the passage of an amendment to the Vocational Education Act of 1963 to provide additional funds for student personnel services.

6. Urges the 90th Congress, second session, to extend the provisions of the Vocational Education Act of 1963 to provide assistance for work-study programs.

7. Supports efforts to repeal separate matching provisions of vocational education legislation that require State matching of Federal funds by specific purpose for which funds are to be spent.

8. In recognition of the need to prepare individuals both as homemakers and as workers outside the home, AVA supports legislation to provide additional funds for programs in home economics for both youth and adults.

9. AVA supports legislation to extend the Manpower Development and Training Act.

10. Urges that funds be appropriated for experimental and demonstration programs of training and education for persons in correctional institutions.

11. Supports efforts to have funds appropriated by Congress specifically designated for the administration of vocational education at the Federal level.

12. For students who enroll in postsecondary vocational-technical education programs, AVA supports a program of Federal assistance for scholarships.

10. ASSOCIATION FOR SUPERVISION AND CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT

The Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development is a national organization open to all who are interested in school improvement: supervisors, curriculum coordinators, directors of curriculum, consultants, professors of education, classroom teachers, principals, superintendents, and parents. In January 1967 total membership in the association numbered 12,161. The breakdown on this figure includes the following: individual membership 10,909, institutional membership 1,252.

Following are excerpts from resolutions adopted at the association's annual conference at Dallas, Tex., March 14, 1967:

> The purpose of "national assessment" is to produce data about the educational attainments of Americans which can be used to influence and help shape national policy in education. National policy in education has traditionally been established by means of Federal legislation and accompanying "guidelines." Almost without exception, such legislation and guidelines have appeared in the form of financial incentives related to specific areas of educational program, and the laws have established standards which result in uniformity of curriculum. Uniformity of curriculum violates all that we know about the importance of human differences and the value we place on uniqueness and the integrity of individual human beings. Furthermore, such policies tend to cause children to be used as means to serve political ends.
>
> * * * * * * *
>
> ASCD urges continued and increasing Federal financial support on a broad basis to American public schools to help them alleviate current problems arising from the complexity of our society. Such support should permit the greatest possible flexibility in expenditures, reducing categorical aid programs to a minimum. Federal aid should take the form of long-term general aid which takes into account ability to pay and is subject to normal auditing controls.
>
> ASCD also urges the U.S. Commissioner of Education to appoint an able and representative body of citizens charged with conducting a continuing study of ways to avoid hazards of Federal control by recommending appropriate criteria, safeguards, and procedures.

11. ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN COLLEGES

The Association of American Colleges is a voluntary, nonprofit organization with a membership, in 1967, of 883 colleges, large and small, church-related and secular, public and private. Its membership is representative of all types of institutions offering 4-year undergraduate courses in the liberal arts and sciences; however, small indepedent or church-related colleges make up three-fourths of the total membership.

The legislative organ of the association is the annual meeting, at which policies are established. Member institutions may send as many representatives as they please to the annual meeting, but each is entitled to be represented by one voting delegate—usually its president. Following is an excerpt from the principal resolution adopted in relation to policies of the Federal Government at the 1967 annual meeting of the association.

> *Be it resolved*, That the association views with serious concern the disparity between the large volume of demand for Federal college housing loans and the small annual authorization of funds available for lending. For institutions that are primarily residential, construction of student housing and feeding facilities must proceed in tandem with construction of academic facilities needed to accommodate increased enrollments. The association urges the President and Congress to give every consideration to discovering ways to create additional lending authority for construction of urgently needed college housing.

12. Association of Classroom Teachers, of the National Education Association

The Association of Classroom Teachers, a department of the National Education Association, is an organization representing approximately 900,000 classroom teachers in the continental United States, Hawaii, Puerto Rico and around the world in the dependent schools operated by the U.S. Department of Defense.

At its representative assembly of 3,959 delegates in Minneapolis in July 1967, the association passed a number of resolutions related to the Federal role in education, including the following statements specifically related to the Federal Government or to Federal laws, programs or agencies:

> The department, recognizing that geographic, racial, political, social, and economic conditions continue to deprive many children and youth of free public education, supports efforts of the Federal Government and of those communities and States that are striving to provide equal educational opportunities for all children and youth. * * *
>
> * * * * * * *
>
> * * * The department * * * has long maintained that the Federal Government must share responsibility with States and communities for solving financial problems of public schools. It stresses the need for long-term Federal funding of educational programs to encourage increased participation in these programs by as many public school systems as possible and to attract to and retain in said programs qualified personnel.
>
> * * * * * * *
>
> * * * The department * * * strongly urges the National Education Association to press for passage of legislation providing tax deductions for educational and professional expenses. It also urges classroom teachers to seek support for such legislation from Congressmen and congressional candidates.
>
> * * * * * * *
>
> The department believes that statements of policies and guidelines for school desegregation developed by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare should be in keeping with the provisions and intent of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and that they should be uniformly applied throughout the Nation.
>
> * * * * * * *
>
> The department believes that academic programs of instruction using local public school facilities financed in whole or in part by funds provided by the Federal Government should be under the control and direction of locally constituted boards of education, such funds to be distributed to provide equitably for all children of the community. The department further believes that curriculums

should be developed and approved by local qualified public school personnel including classroom teachers, administered by local public school administrators, and conducted under the personal direction of properly qualified and licensed classroom teachers.

* * * * * * *

The department recognizes that the Teacher Corps is providing a unique service to children. It is concerned, however, about the preparation required of and being given Corps personnel as related to the assignments they are given in the school system. It maintains that certain tasks are the unique responsibility of the certificated educator and that only those individuals who meet the high standards of professional preparation as called for by the National Eduction Association and the NEA Department of Classroom Teachers are qualified to perform these tasks. * * *

The department supports action of the Representative Assembly of the National Education Association calling for the creation of a Department of Education with Cabinet status. It urges that the function of such a Department be defined to include not only programs currently administered by the U.S. Office of Education but also all educational programs involving public elementary and secondary schools and/or personnel that are presently administered by any unit of the Federal Government such as the Department of Defense, Department of the Interior, Department of Labor, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Office of Economic Opportunity, and others.

* * * * * * *

13. Association of School Business Officials of the United States and Canada

The Association of School Business Officials is a nonprofit educational organization dedicated to researching, determining, and disseminating better methods of school business administration. The association has approximately 4,000 members and subscribers, representing all of the 50 States, but mainly the 3,000 largest school districts in the Nation.

The following resolution was adopted by the association in convention assembled on October 12, 1966:

During the past several years, Federal legislation has made available substantial amounts of money for certain specific kinds of educational programs to be conducted by local school districts.

The Association of School Business Officials of the United States and Canada is concerned with the burdens placed on the business services of school districts and State departments of education in the implementation of those projects, such as the problems involved in accounting, payroll, purchasing, maintenance, operations, property accounting, and inventory controls.

The association recommends:

1. That its governing body make known to Congress and the U.S. Office of Education its interest in being consulted before enacting, amending, or reenacting legislation or administrative rules affecting Federal financial support of public education;
2. That an allowance be made in the appropriation for administration and implementation of federally supported projects; and
3. That copies of this resolution be delivered by the executive secretary to the appropriate Federal officials with an offer to provide advisory and consulting personnel from among the membership of the association.

14. Association of State Colleges and Universities

The Association of State Colleges and Universities consists of 208 institutions and seven statewide systems of State colleges located in 41 States and the Island of Guam.

Approximately 1 million students—or one out of five college students in the United States—attend the type of institutions represented by the association.

In sessions held November 13–16, 1966, in Washington, D.C., the Association of State Colleges and Universities and the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges jointly adopted a statement of policy positions concerning recommendations for national action affecting higher education. This 29-page joint statement is too lengthy for quotation here. However, in a letter to the writer of this report dated October 19, 1967, the executive director of the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges summarized the position on major issues set forth in the joint statement and commented upon the prospect for a change in that position in 1967 as follows:

> * * * I am reasonably confident there will be no change in our fundamental position on major issues.
>
> That is to say, we will continue to support, as a first priority item, measures designed to increase the capacity of colleges and universities, both public and private, to give high quality instruction to increasing numbers of students without escalating charges to students to the extent that financial rather than academic ability becomes a major determinant of access to higher education.
>
> Such programs include: (1) Increasing the Federal proportion of grants for academic and other facilities to 75 percent of the total. (2) A program of general Federal operating support. Specifically, we have endorsed and strongly support the "Miller Bill" (H.R. 875) described in our statement in general terms as a "new program of Federal support in the sciences."
>
> We would also be prepared to support other general support programs under different formulas.
>
> We will continue to support various forms of student loan programs, as a necessary means of helping students meet the increasing cost to them of education. We feel, however, that if such programs are a form of "attacking the symptoms" rather than basic problems and that if there is a substantial support of the cost of institutional facilities and operations, the problem of direct aid to students through loans, and so forth, will diminish, and can be concentrated in the form of loans, grants, work-study, and so forth, on those students who are in greatest need of aid.
>
> A majority of Federal programs in recent years have concentrated on helping students get money to go to college, rather than on helping institutions accommodate and instruct them. Virtually all of these programs, and many others of a categorical nature, have required substantial contributions of institutional funds, and have thereby made it necessary to increase institutional charges to provide operating support. Thus the more students that are aided by this route, the more institutions have to raise their charges, and the larger the number of students who need aid to go to college.
>
> We will continue to oppose programs designed to make students pay substantially more of the cost of their education than at present—or to give special preference in Federal aid to those who are reasonably well off economically as opposed to those who need aid the most. Such programs include tuition tax credit legislation and so-called Educational Opportunity Bank legislation.

15. COUNCIL FOR EXCEPTIONAL CHILDREN

The Council for Exceptional Children is an association of educators and other specialists having major concern for children and youth whose needs differ sufficiently from others to require special instruction and services not available through regular education: The council is a 31,000-member department of the National Education Association.

Following is an excerpt from a policy statement regarding Federal legislation which was adopted by the delegate assembly of the council in March 1964:

* * * * * * *

> Federal programs designed to extend and improve the training of personnel, research, and demonstration, and direct services to children, require effective

coordination in planning and implementation to achieve a functional and effective realization of intent. * * *

* * * * * * *

* * * The Federal Government has an unusual opportunity to upgrade and expand school services for the handicapped, the gifted and other children through stimulating the adequate preparation of special education personnel. The council believes that Public Law 88–164 is an effective legislative act which will greatly improve the quality and availability of school services for exceptional children and youth. The council urges the extension and improvement of this law and other legislation which will help to provide adequate facilities, materials, equipment, curriculum laboratories, and research.

Funds to stimulate the further development of adequate educational programs for gifted and for handicapped children and youth should be provided to public and private nonprofit organizations and agencies. The council believes that there should be grants to the States which would enable them to support the stimulation and development of State and local programs designed to provide the best possible educational opportunities to handicapped and gifted children. * * *

16. DEPARTMENT OF ELEMENTARY-KINDERGARTEN-NURSERY EDUCATION (NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION)

The Department of Elementary-Kindergarten-Nursery Education of the National Education Association is an organization of about 4,500 professional people interested in elementary, kindergarten, and nursery education.

Following is an excerpt from a resolution adopted by the department at its annual meeting in Minneapolis, Minn., July 3, 1967:

* * * * * * *

On July 3 in the year 1967, the Department of Elementary-Kindergarten-Nursery Education, NEA, reaffirms that commitment to help every child reach his fullest potential for a creative and useful life and to that end further resolves the following:

1. Concurs with the 1967 AASA stand relative to programs for young children, to wit:

(*c*) "* * * the educational and financial provision of Project Headstart should be expanded and incorporated in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965."

* * * * * * *

4. Recommends increasing Federal funding to upgrade the educational program and supports general aid to local school systems allowing for local prerogative in determining how such funds will be used to benefit children.

17. EDUCATIONAL POLICIES COMMISSION [4]

The Educational Policies Commission, established in 1935, is an autonomous, deliberative body financed mainly by the American Association of School Administrators and the National Education Association. The commission does not make policy for the sponsoring organizations but acts as an independent voice on behalf of education. The commission is composed of 20 men and women widely experienced in a variety of educational interests. The commission identifies significant educational problems and issues, studies them, and publishes policy recommendations concerning them.

Following are excerpts from a statement on "Federal Financial Relations to Education" issued by the Educational Policies Commission in 1967:

After decades of dealing with categorical grants in small doses, the Federal Government, through the ESEA, embarked on a radical expansion of that approach to the support of education in the States and localities. The results have been unlike the intentions. Categorical aid has served to increase Federal control of education and to confuse the problem of allocation of public funds to nonpublic schools, and has had limited success in reducing the problems of school segregation. This is not to suggest that Federal categorical aid has been nefarious or ineffective, but does suggest that it has prompted many unanticipated consequences and that it is not the most effective pattern of massive, ongoing Federal financial participation in the educational enterprise.

---

[4] The information given here was obtained from the Commission in the fall of 1967, the time of preparation of this chapter. The Commission has since dissolved.

Categorical grants have been accepted by the educational community as a means of getting a flow of Federal funds established. That flow is now established. We believe that the time has come when the problems associated with categorical grants require amelioration. The assets of categorical aids—particularly their one key asset, political attractiveness—no longer justify exclusive reliance upon them. It is time, therefore, to institute practical measures which will tend to reduce dependence on categorical grants and to increase reliance on the more reliable kind of support—general support—to which we now turn.

18. Institute of International Education

The Institute of International Education, founded in 1919, is a private, nonprofit organization which develops programs of educational exchange for foundations, private organizations, governments, universities, and corporations in the United States and abroad. Each year approximately 7,500 students, teachers, technicians, and specialists from about 125 countries study or train through these programs.

The following statement, concerning the attitude of the institute toward relationships between the Federal Government and private organizations like the institute, was received by the writer of this report from the president of the Institute of International Education on November 22, 1967:

> Since the early 1940's the Institute of International Education has contracted with the U.S. Government to provide services for the exchange of students, leaders, and specialists. The first contract was with the Office of Inter-American Affairs. Similar arrangements were made subsequently with the Department of State, the Department of Defense, and the AID.
>
> At the present time about one-quarter of our annual administrative budget of $4 million comes in the form of reimbursements under contracts administered for these Government agencies. * * *
>
> The institute believes that the type of contractual relationship which we have had with the Federal Government should be the basis of operation in the field of international education. We believe very strongly, however, that with the diminution of funds from private sources when vastly expanded international programs are needed, it is essential for the Government to not only reimburse private organizations for such services but also to contribute directly to their support.

19. Modern Language Association of America

The Modern Language Association is an organization of 25,000 colleges and university teachers of English and the modern foreign languages. Since 1958, it has worked closely with the U.S. Office of Education in improving the teaching of the foreign languages through NDEA and improving the teaching of English through Project English. Presently it is working with the National Endowment for the Humanities to produce new and definitive editions of classic American authors (Emerson, Whitman, Melville, etc.). At its 81st annual business meeting, in December 1966, the association resolved:

> That it hopes that the first session of the 90th Congress will sufficiently increase the appropriations of the National Endowment for the Humanities that they may support the humanities at a level sufficiently high to begin to have a measurable impact upon the life of the Nation.

20. NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE UNIVERSITIES AND LAND-GRANT COLLEGES

The National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges consists of 99 State and land-grant universities and colleges located in each of the 50 States and Puerto Rico. Together, these institutions grant more than one-fourth of all baccalaureate degrees and almost three-fifths of all the doctoral degrees awarded by American institutions of higher education.

Founded in 1887, the association is the oldest organization of institutions of higher education in this country. It is a completely independent organization that determines its own policies and procedures by action of delegates representing all member institutions in annual convention.

A statement regarding the association's recommendations for national action concerning higher education appears in this report under the heading "Association of State Colleges and Universities," above.

21. NATIONAL CITIZENS COMMITTEE FOR THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

The National Citizens Committee for the Public Schools is a nonprofit, nonpartisan group of about 1,500 local, State and National leaders, organized to promote adequate financial support for the public schools from local, State, and Federal sources.

A currently effective statement of policy written and approved by the executive committee of the organization in 1964 contains the following statement:

> The committee believes that existing inequities must be corrected and that the national, local, and State governments must share together in accepting financial responsibility for building a public school system in which every child in the country has an equal chance to obtain the education his talents deserve.

22. NATIONAL CONGRESS OF PARENTS AND TEACHERS

The National Congress of Parents and Teachers (National PTA) is a nonsectarian, nonpartisan, noncommercial, voluntary membership organization. More than 11 million members belong to 44,968 local PTA's, in every State, the District of Columbia, and in the European Congress of American Parents and Teachers. There are also National PTA local units in Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Virgin Islands, and on the island of Guam, as well as on American military bases in Bermuda, Cuba, Japan, Okinawa, the Philippines, Puerto Rico, and Taiwan.

The National PTA has certain basic legislative policies, each of which must be approved by at least 31 State PTA's before it can be added to, or removed from, the national program. According to information obtained from the national headquarters, these policies, which determine at all times the legislative action by the organization, may be summarized as follows:

> (1) That the provision of education, health, and welfare services is basically a responsibility of local and State governments; (2) That each community should finance these services to the fullest extent of its ability with the States giving their best support to equalizing opportunities and services in these areas; (3) That Federal funds for the education, health, and welfare of children and youth should be used only by public boards, departments, and agencies; (4) That all

Federal legislation concerned with education and child welfare must include provisions that will insure maximum State and local control; (5) That determination of educational curriculums and standards for public schools must be a State and local responsibility; (6) That those Federal offices and agencies responsible for carrying out legislation concerned with education and child welfare must be supported by funds adequate to meet the legislative requirements; (7) That Federal grants to States should be made through the Federal agencies that are most directly concerned with the legislative enactment involved and then administered by the comparable State and local agencies; and (8) that Federal funds for education must be appropriated only for publicly controlled, tax-supported schools.

23. National Council on Schoolhouse Construction

The National Council on Schoolhouse Construction, founded in 1921, is a professional, nonprofit, incorporated, private organization of approximately 1,200 educational facility specialists in the United States, Canada, and various foreign countries. The basic purpose of the council is to improve education through its influence on the planning of educational facilities.

At its 43d annual meeting the council membership adopted the following resolution:

> The council reiterates its earnest hope that the U.S. Commissioner of Education will give serious consideration to the reestablishment of the School Housing Section of the U.S. Office of Education to the end that this agency will assume again its important role of leadership and the provision of services in the school plant planning field.

24. National Education Association of the United States

The National Education Association is an independent, voluntary, nongovernment organization with a membership of 1,030,000 professional educators. Overall policies for guiding the affairs of the NEA are made by the officers and governing bodies. The representative assembly brings together about 7,000 delegates sent by affiliated local and State education associations. The annual resolutions of the representative assembly establish policies which outline the general program and guide the activities of the officers and staff throughout the year.

Resolutions adopted by the representative assembly in 1967 include the following:

67–4. Federal support of public education

The National Education Association seeks Federal support of public education in line with the following principles and in full compliance with the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

(*a*) That there be substantial general Federal support of the whole of public education.

(*b*) That present Federal programs of specific aids be continued, expanded, and improved by consolidation, simplified administration, and reporting, and that their evaluation be primarily a State and local responsibility.

(*c*) That further expansion related to Federal support to education be general in nature, and that these funds be allocated without Federal control to State education agencies to supplement and to be used as State public education funds.

(*d*) That the amount of aid be generally predictable for long-range planning and specially predictable for year-to-year planning.

(*e*) That distribution of the Federal funds within States permit the same administrative discretion as for State public education funds.

(*f*) That expenditure of the Federal funds be only for the purposes for which the States and localities, under their constitutions and statutes, may expend their own public education funds.

(*g*) That the legislation be consistent with the constitutional provision respecting an establishment of religion and with the tradition of separation of church and state.

(*h*) That the legislation contain provision for judicial review as to its constitutionality.

(*i*) That Federal educational programs be administered by a Cabinet Department of Education and, pending the establishment of such a Department, by the U.S. Office of Education.

The National Education Association urges its officers, directors, affiliates, and legislative commission to develop, seek, and continuously review legislative programs to realize these princples and report any irregularities in the expenditure of such funds to the U.S. Office of Education or such other agencies as may have authority to make the necessary corrections.

67–6. Tax deductions for professional expenses

The National Education Assocation belives that the nature of teaching requires all teachers to seek continuous growth and professional development. It further believes that diverse and conflicting interpretations by the Internal Revenue Service in regard to summer school and other professional expenses create gross inequities. The National Education Association therefore urges enactment of Federal legislation to establish such expenses as legitimate business expenses that are uniformly deductible by members of the teaching profession in the computation of Federal income taxes.

* * * * * * *

67–9. International education

International education is and has been an important part of American education. Improvement of international education is therefore a goal of the National Education Association. To this end Federal legislation is needed. The association urges its legislative commission to exert every effort to insure the full funding and implementation of the International Education Act of 1966 and to encourage full participation by institutions of teacher education.

25. PHILOSOPHY OF EDUCATION SOCIETY

The Philosophy of Education Society is the only scholarly, professional organization in the United States whose major purpose is the improvement of the fundamental philosophic treatment of the problems of education. The membership includes 241 fellows and 2,666 associates.

The following statement was received from the president of the society for inclusion in this report:

> To the best of my knowledge the one position statement, concerning the Federal role in education, which represents the view of almost all members of the society, is the belief that the major agencies of the Federal Government which are primarily concerned with education—such as the USOE—should make extensive and systematic use of the skills and considerations that philosophers of education can bring to the analysis and evaluation of educational problems and activities. The Philsophy of Education Society will be happy to contribute to this end.

K. OTHER ORGANIZATIONS

1. AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF SCIENCE

The American Association for the Advancement of Science is a membership organization founded in 1848 to represent all fields of science. It now includes 115,000 members and has as its formal affiliates 293 other national and regional scientific and educational organizations in the United States. The association exists to further the work of scientists, to facilitate cooperation among scientists, to improve the effectiveness of science in the promotion of human welfare, and to increase public understanding and appreciation of the importance and promise of the methods of science in human progress.

The council of the association consists of 550 members made up of the association's elected officers, the elected representatives of the affiliated scientific societies, and elected representatives of the association's regional divisions. Still in effect is the following resolution adopted by the council on December 30, 1957.

> Whereas it is desirable that financial contributions by the American people to the support of science and education be increased; and
>
> Whereas the tax incentives to make such contributions are relatively great for taxpayers in upper income brackets but decrease, relatively, as income tax liability decreases: Therefore
>
> *Resolved*, That the Council of the AAAS favors such revisions of Federal and State income tax laws as will provide greater incentives to contribute to education and science.

2. AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION

Founded in 1878, the American Bar Association has a membership of approximately 118,000 attorneys. Eligibility for membership requires admission to the bar of any one of the 50 States. The Association is composed of a number of sections, one of which is the Section of Legal Education and Admissions to the Bar.

In February 1967 the Section of Legal Education and Admissions to the Bar adopted the following resolution:

> *Resolved*, That the American Bar Association favors the inclusion of legal education in Federal programs of aid to higher education at levels consistent with the national importance of the field of law.

In August 1967 the Section of Legal Education and Admissions to the Bar adopted the following resolution:

> * * * be it further
>
> *Resolved*, That the American Bar Association favors financial support by the Federal Government, through an appropriate agency, for the development and operation of organized programs of instruction in schools approved by the American Bar Association to train law students in the conduct of criminal cases involving indigent persons, giving emphasis to both prosecution and the defense of such cases, including instruction in the methods and problems involved, training in the practical aspects of the conduct of a trial, and actual court experience by students to the extent practicable under adequate supervision.

3. AMERICAN LEGION

The American Legion is a veterans' organization devoted to advancing veterans' aims and interests, continuing the friendships formed while in service, and seeing that disabled veterans and their dependents receive the care and help they need. The present membership consists of more than 2,600,000 persons. The American Legion has many and varied interests. As an organization, the American Legion has long been interested in the education field where it became especially active during the depression.

Each year a national convention is held where delegates, selected by the various posts and State organizations of the American Legion, vote on policy matters. Following is an extract from the "American Legion Policy Statement on Education," which was adopted at its national convention in Minneapolis-St. Paul in 1959 and amended by the National Executive Committee at their meeting on October 18–19, 1967. (According to information obtained from the national headquarters of the American Legion, its position with respect to legislation is supported by the American Legion auxiliary, which has a membership of over 900,000.)

CONTROL AND FINANCING

The American Legion is opposed to Federal financing of schools to replace local and State financing. The genius of the American public schools has been in its closeness to the people. Our structure of government in its historical development has placed the responsibility of public education upon the several States.

The American Legion advocates the proposition that under our system of government each State is vested with the authority, direction and control of public education within its borders in accordance with law. The American Legion further believes in the largest possible measure of home rule in public education and that States should delegate to local communities the greatest autonomy that is feasible.

It is recognized that conditions and needs change from time to time and the supplemental participation of the Federal Government may be desirable in times of national emergency, and in the development of educational goals which are in the national interest.

FEDERAL EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES OF NATIONAL INTEREST

(*a*) *Armed Forces.*—The American Legion recognizes that the Federal Government has a continuing and justifiable primary responsibility for organizing, administering, operating and financing educational programs of the Armed Forces.

(*b*) *Research.*—The American Legion realizes that research, both basic and applied, will create the frontiers of tomorrow in economic, social and civic life. The role of the Federal Government in research should primarily support requirements for the operation of programs of Federal agencies. The Federal Government, State public institutions of higher learning and private agencies all have a responsibility to further the development of research.

(*c*) *"G.I. bill."*—In time of war when young men and women are required to enter the Armed Forces for extended periods of time, it is in the national interest for the Federal Government, as part of the program for the rehabilitation and restoration of these individuals to proper roles in civilian life, to provide special programs of educational benefits, and thus restore to them opportunities which they lose because of their service in time of war.

* * * * * * *

(*d*) *Educational leadership.*—The needs of the present often far exceed the geographic limitations of the various political subdivisions of our Nation. Leadership at the national level is required in the solution of many of our educational problems. The Federal Government, through the President, the Congress, and the agencies prescribed through law have a role of leadership in the educational questions related to the national interest. However, the American Legion holds that this role of leadership should be exercised with minimal Federal control.

4. AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION

The American Medical Association (AMA) is a national organization of members of the medical profession in the United States. It is composed of 1,936 county and district medical societies having about 210,000 members. These local groups elect representatives to the 50 State medical associations and to the medical associations of the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the Isthmus of Panama. These groups, in turn, elect representatives to the house of delegates, the national legislative body, of the AMA, on a proportional basis. The State delegates comprise the bulk of the membership of the house of delegates but it also includes one representative from each of the 20 sections of the AMA's Scientific Assembly.

The present position of the association regarding Federal legislation to aid medical school construction was established by a resolution of the house of delegates in 1951. The resolution called for—

A one-time Federal grant-in-aid on a matching basis, based on the Hill-Burton Act formula and administrative machinery, for construction, equipment, and renovation of the physical plants of medical schools. No part of the funds shall be used in any manner for operational expenses or salaries.

In November 1965, the house of delegates approved a report of the board of trustees on "Federal Aid to Medical Education" containing the following statements:

(1) A major objective of the policies of the American Medical Association in medical education should be to place the control of the full range of medical school functions in their institutional governing bodies. (2) Action of the American Medical Association should be designed to achieve this objective by proposal of appropriate legislation. (3) The American Medical Association should foster diverse sources of support for medical schools under circumstances that prevent any extramural source from exercising controlling influence.

5. American Psychiatric Association

The American Psychiatric Association, founded in 1844, is the major professional association in the United States for physicians who specialize in psychiatry. Its membership, which also includes psychiatrists in Canada, Central America and the Caribbean, totals about 16,000.

The following information was obtained from the national office of the association for inclusion in this report:

Implicitly, the association supports a vigorous role for the Federal Government in advancing the Nation's educational system. Explicitly, it supports and urges a wide range of Federal programs of support to the States and communities for the following purposes:

(*a*) To improve the content and method of medical education in general and of psychiatric education in particular. (*b*) To establish special techniques and to train special teachers for the mentally retarded and emotionally handicapped children. (*c*) To provide training support through stipends and fellowships for the core mental health disciplines, psychiatry, psychology, social work, and nursing. * * * (*d*) To support in-service training programs for nonprofessional psychiatric personnel, chiefly psychiatric nursing aides. * * * (*e*) To further public education in mental health principles. * * * (*f*) To educate teachers in mental health principles that they may recognize and better manage emotionally disturbed children. (*g*) To further the rehabilitation of mentally ill persons through reeducation and vocational training. (*h*) To combat juvenile delinquency and in general to support psychiatrically oriented treatment and care facilities for the guidance of adolescents in trouble.

6. National Association for the Advancement of Colored People

A publication of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People entitled "This Is the NAACP" contains the following statement:

The National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), founded in 1909 to work for full equality for Negro Americans, is today the nation's largest civil rights organization with nearly 465,000 members in 50 states and the District of Columbia. There are 1,948 units of the association.

* * * * * * *

The basic policies of the association are developed at its annual conventions by delegates elected to represent local NAACP units.

* * * * * * *

A number of resolutions concerning education were adopted by the 58th Annual Convention of the NAACP at Boston, Mass., July 10–15, 1967. Following are excerpts from these resolutions relating particularly to the Federal role in education or to the Federal Government.

EDUCATION

25. BASIC POLICY STATEMENT

* * * * * * *

The U.S. Supreme Court directed the country's attention to the damaging effects of segregated public schools when it held, on May 17, 1954, that racial segregation per se in public education was inherently discriminatory and denied Negro children equal educational opportunities.

Thirteen years later, however, the facts reported by the 1966 White House Conference "To Fulfill These Rights" have not altered. "Three basic facts highlight the failure to provide equality of educational opportunity. The first is that the overwhelming majority of American schoolchildren, more than 90 percent, are educated in racially segregated schools. The second is that segregated Negro schools, by all available criteria, are almost without exception inferior in quality to white schools. The third is that segregated schools, both white and Negro, provide inferior education by definition for they fail to prepare their pupils for life in our pluralistic society and ever-shrinking world."

We call upon all units of the association, North and South, to expand and intensify efforts to end all forms of racially segregated schools, raise educational standards of long-neglected schools and correct all other inequities and discriminatory practices affecting Negro students and teachers.

26. SCHOOL DESEGREGATION IN THE SOUTH

* * * * * * *

While we remain critical of the desegregation guidelines as developed by the Office of Education, set forth later, we call upon all of our branches to insure that local school systems comply fully with those regulations affecting Negro students and teachers. Where violations exist, branches should immediately file complaints with the Office of Education calling for the withholding of Federal funds.

We also call upon our branches to urge Negro parents to exercise their rights for their children and to assist parents in taking whatever steps are necessary, including filing complaints with the U.S. Office of Education and community action, in order to insure that school boards properly admit and protect Negro children in desegregated schools.

In the light of recent Federal court decisions giving support and sanction to the U.S. Office of Education guidelines, it is incumbent upon our branches to take the necessary steps to see that these advances are implemented in local school desegregation programs.

* * * * * * *

We call upon our branches to oppose all token desegregation plans and to mount vigorous new school-teacher desegregation efforts, utilizing all means available: mobilization of parent-community support and encouragement of Negro parents to exercise their constitutional rights, enrolling their children in increasing numbers in desegregated schools, negotiations and political persuasion, community action, protest demonstrations, filing complaints with the U.S. Office of Education, and legal action.

* * * * * * *

27. SEGREGATED PUBLIC SCHOOLS IN THE NORTH AND WEST

The May 17, 1954, decision of the U.S. Supreme Court held that racial segregation per se in public education is discriminatory and unconstitutional. While segregated schools in the North and West result from many causes, ranging from deliberate action and practices of racial containment to school districting which conform to segregated housing patterns, it is clear that racially segregated schools, whatever the cause, are educationally harmful for Negro and white students alike. Segregated schools, North as well as South, violate the basic objectives of a democratic education for all children.

30. NAACP OBJECTIVES

* * * * * * *

We are vigorously opposed to voluntary pupil transfer plans (open enrollment or freedom of choice) when used alone or when more effective desegregation plans can be used. We are opposed to other plans which leave the pattern of segregated schools unchanged and will oppose the use of Federal funds for such evasive plans.

* * * * * * *

(8) The appropriation of Federal, State and municipal funds to make a college education possible for students who otherwise would be stopped by lack of funds.

* * * * * * *

32. 1965 ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT

Title I of the 1965 Elementary and Secondary Education Act makes possible critically needed programs to strengthen schools and raise educational standards. Thus far, however, the vast majority of school officials have failed to utilize title I to improve and strengthen regular school programs.

The lasting effectiveness of preschool education or after-school remedial classes is dependent upon improvement of the schools themselves. We are opposed to special so-called "compensatory" projects in the absence of new efforts to improve the regular school program.

We urge our branches to examine critically title I proposals for the 1967–68 school year and to press vigorously for plans which gives priority to reading and remedial programs during regular school hours and to plans designed to raise the expectations and performance of teachers and administrators.

We caution, however, that title I programs must not be used as a substitute for effective desegregation.

We urge that kindergarten and preschool projects be expanded on a year-round basis as a regular part of the public school program.

Employment policies and practices for all ESEA programs and antipoverty programs, affecting schools must be nondiscriminatory to insure the placement of Negroes at all levels.

33. BOOKS AND CURRICULUM MATERIALS

We strongly urge school officials to replace biased, stereotyped schoolbooks and classroom aids with newly available books and curriculum materials which accurately reflect in text and illustrations, the history and relevance of Negroes and other minorities. We urge State and national education officials to exercise leadership and guidance to local school systems in this regard.

We also urge school officials to apply for title II funds of the 1965 Elementary and Secondary Education Act, supplementing regular school budgets, to purchase these new books and curriculum materials. We are appalled by the lack of leadership shown thus far by school officials in utilizing title II funds for this purpose.

The NAACP will vigorously oppose using public funds, and especially title II funds, to purchase racially biased stereotyped books which distort American history and any other books which fail to portray an integrated, multiracial society.

We call upon NAACP branches, youth councils, and college chapters, north and south, to examine schoolbooks now in use, determine how title II funds are being used, and initiate new efforts to encourage the use of multiracial books and curriculum materials in all preschool, elementary, and secondary schools throughout local school systems and by appropriate community groups. We suggest that branches be guided by the selected book listing prepared by the national office.

* * * * * * *

34. NEGRO HISTORY AND TEACHER TRAINING

We urge legislation to obtain Federal assistance in making pertinent facts of Negro history more available. We support the concept of emphasizing the fact that the history of the colored people of this country is a part of the total picture and not a separate item which can be omitted from standard history books which purport to give the true story of the Nation.

* * * * * * *

36. HEW, TITLE VI, AND SCHOOLS IN THE SOUTH

The NAACP is severely critical of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Office of Education, for its failure to adopt adequate school desegregation policies and its failure to enforce the policies it has adopted.

However, we fully recognize and must act to fight the political and congressional influences which are brought to bear to weaken HEW and the Office of Education efforts to implement desegregation.

While the 1966 Guidelines of the U.S. Office of Education strengthen earlier HEW requirements, we believe that the new guidelines fall far short of clear intent of the May 17, 1954, decision and the 1964 Civil Rights Act.

We strongly urge the Office of Education to revise its policy guidelines by (1) rejecting voluntary pupil transfer or "freedom of choice" plans; (2) requiring geographic rezoning plans which are drawn to end segregation to the fullest extent possible; (3) requiring site selection for new schools and other school expansion programs to correct existing segregation and prevent new segregated white and Negro schools wherever possible; and (4) refusing to fund school boards operating under court-approved plans which do not meet the new requirements.

We are deeply concerned that the Office of Education and HEW are approving and/or accepting local desegregation plans for the 1967–68 school year which violate their own guidelines, sometimes without examining those plans. HEW is thereby inviting promises instead of compliance in exchange for Federal funds.

We call upon HEW and the Office of Education to examine carefully plans submitted to them, to reject all plans which fail to implement their own requirements, and to withhold Federal funds, wherever necessary, under title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act from all school systems which adopt token plans of desegregation, fail to comply with present requirements of the U.S. Office of Education, adopt geographic zoning plans based on segregated housing, continue to maintain unequal as well as segregated schools, or plan the continuation of new segregated white and Negro schools, where alternative plans are administratively possible.

37. HEW, TITLE VI AND PUBLIC SCHOOLS, NORTH AND WEST

The NAACP calls upon the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Office of Education to withhold funds, under title VI of the Civil Rights Act from school systems which fail to end (1) racially discriminatory school zoning affecting pupil assignments; (2) inequalities between white and Negro schools; (3) discriminatory practices affecting the employment and assignment of Negro principals, administrators, and teachers; and (4) patterns of de facto segregation. We also urge that Federal funds be withheld from school systems where school construction plans fail to correct existing segregation or will result in new segregated white or Negro schools wherever alternatives for desegregation are administratively possible.

We call upon our branches in the North and West, in consultation with the national office, to file complaints with HEW and the Office of Education to withhold Federal funds, under title VI, from public school systems which stubbornly and persistently refuse to end the above discriminatory practices affecting Negro students, teachers, and administrators.

38. PROPOSED FEDERAL LEGISLATION

We call for legislation revising title IV of the 1964 Civil Rights Act so as to require the correction of racially imbalanced public schools.

We call for the adoption of Federal legislation which specifically requires the correction of racially concentrated schools to the fullest extent possible, North as well as South, and the withholding of Federal funds from public school systems which fail to do so.

We strongly reassert our position that all Federal aid to education must be accompanied by guidelines specifying the purposes and objectives of such appropriations and be in conformance with title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act.

We urge the enactment of whatever legislation is necessary and the establishment of new programs to insure that all veterans regardless of previous educational experience can have the opportunity to obtain a college education, including whatever preparatory education may be necessary in this regard.

39. RACIAL ISOLATION IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

The new report of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights further documents the serious extent of racially segregated public schools throughout our Nation, and the grave damage which results to white and Negro children. The report is an invaluable contribution to the struggle for equal educational opportunities.

The Commission's findings on the limited effectiveness of many so-called compensatory education programs challenge the validity of these programs as they exist in our schools and thus make clear the urgency of developing new programs with adequate financing for improving overall levels of school instruction. Special education programs, whatever they are called, do not substitute for either desegregation or fundamental school improvements.

40. DEMONSTRATION CITIES PROGRAM (MODEL CITIES PROGRAM)

We strongly oppose any plans under the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966 which would result in new segregated Negro schools. We strongly urge, therefore, that any city designated as a "demonstration city" under this act be required to include plans to prevent new segregated schools and to correct existing segregation in the schools.

43. EMPLOYMENT OF NEGRO TEACHERS

We call to the attention of our branches an important court decision requiring school boards of segregated schools in the South to integrate, at least to the extent of the standards imposed by the HEW guidelines. In the course of proceeding from a biracial to a unitary integrated school system, administrators and boards are precluded from discharging or demoting Negro teachers.

We direct that all branches maintain a close watch on school boards to assure that qualified Negro teachers will not be discharged or victimized in the integration process.

This convention pledges all of its resources in giving aid and assistance to all Negro teachers whose jobs might be jeopardized because of public school integration.

7. NATIONAL URBAN LEAGUE

The National Urban League is a nonprofit, charitable, and educational organization founded in 1910 to secure equal opportunities for Negro citizens. It is nonpartisan and interracial in its leadership and staff. The National Urban League has affiliates in 88 cities in 33 States and the District of Columbia.

Following are excerpts from two "statements of concern" adopted by the delegate assembly of the National Urban League at Portland, Oreg., on August 23, 1967.

CLOSING THE EDUCATIONAL GAP

There is sufficient evidence to indicate that the educational gap in relation to average number of years of school completed is closing between nonwhites and whites.

In spite of this apparent gain, the gap in economic security has widened.

Much of the inequity can be related to the level of educational achievement which is the degree to which nonwhites are not enrolled in specialized educational opportunities.

* * * * * * *

In the survey for vocational, technical, and higher education conducted by the education area of NUL in March 1967, we note that schools in vocational and technical programs, reported by various States, include 5 Negroes out of 1,000, 13 out of 1,600 students.

Much of this lack of participation in more meaningful educational opportunity, which would in the end contribute to closing the income gap, stems from the critical problem of inadequate preparation at the elementary level.

Patterns of this are often evident in situations where the facts are available. For example, median reading and math achievement scores in deprived community schools, when compared with other areas, often attest to a poor quality of education.

Therefore, it is recommended that the National Urban League accept as a major focus those steps which need to be taken to insure a quality elementary educational experience for minority group members.

NEW CAREERS

Under the 1966 amendment to the Equal Opportunity Act, section 205E, over $30 million was made available for the training of nonprofessional auxiliary personnel in the field of public service. This money is to go to local communities for the training for "New Careers" of impoverished and underemployed residents. The National Urban League and its local affiliates, because of their roots in the low-income disadvantaged community and because of their ongoing experience in job development and training, are in a unique position to be able to supervise and carry out training programs of this type.

CHAPTER 7. SUMMARY OF PART I

A. ISSUES AND RELEVANT CONSIDERATIONS

In an atmosphere of urgency created by Russian achievements in the conquest of space, about a decade ago the American people undertook a reevaluation of their educational policies and programs. This reevaluation has involved reconsideration of the role of every level of government, but particularly the Federal role, in the field of education and training in the United States.

Carrying out its constitutional and inherent responsibilities, the Congress has exercised leadership in the continuing study of Federal educational policies and programs. Within the last decade it has greatly enlarged the Federal role in education and training and has established a number of new Federal programs in this field.

But the question of what the Federal Government should or should not do in the field of education and training remains constantly before Congress. In order intelligently to consider new legislative proposals advanced by governmental and nongovernmental organizations and agencies, the Congress must have detailed information on what the Federal Government is already doing in this field. This means that the Congress must have current information concerning several hundred educational activities already being carried out by the various departments and independent agencies of the Government.

Board study of relevant literature of the last several years shows a continuing public concern particularly over questions concerning Federal controls over education, Federal aid to nonpublic schools, and racial integration or de facto segregation in schools. There are many subsidiary issues, as well as issues less related to these, pending future congressional consideration. This report, the first of its kind since 1960, has undertaken to supply some of the basic information needed by the Congress to perform its legislative task in this field.

B. DEVELOPMENT OF FEDERAL POLICIES AND PROGRAMS, 1777–1960

From its inception the Federal Government has engaged in two types of educational activities: (1) operating its own educational programs, and (2) aiding the States and outlying possessions in financing and promoting education.

Apparently the central government's own educational pursuits started in 1777 with the instruction of men in the military service. Even at that early date some military personnel schooling was being given in mathematics. Less than a decade later, in 1785, by setting aside public lands for the endowment of schools, the Congress of the Confederation initiated a policy of providing aid to the territories and States for the support of education.

Under the Constitution, general jurisdiction over education is left to the States. Certain constitutional provisions, however, have been cited as warrants for the development of Federal educational programs. Especially significant has been the "general welfare" clause, under which Congress has appropriated funds for a variety of educational activities.

During the first half of the 19th century the Congress pursued a policy of giving public land and monetary grants to the territories and States for the support of education without stipulation as to the kind of education to receive aid.

Education for national defense.—The Federal Government's own programs of education for national defense have covered all educational levels from teaching illiterates to read and write during World War II to provision for current graduate courses at some of the Nation's leading universities.

The Military Academy at West Point was established in 1802. An act of July 1866 marked the beginning of the long-lived post-school system for enlisted men. The National Defense Act of 1916 as amended in 1920 established the Reserve Officers' Training Corps at 4-year universities and colleges. This marked a new policy in Federal activities in education involving close working relationships with civil educational institutions.

Under the Army specialized-training program organized during World War II, many thousands of soldiers were sent to the best universities in the country. The year 1947 saw the beginning of a new Army policy and program for the education of dependents.

Besides the facilities of its service schools and other resources, the Army now utilizes selected civilian educational institutions on a requirements basis for duty-time courses for Army personnel.

From the earliest days of its service, the Navy has pursued a policy of providing educational programs for both its officer and enlisted personnel. The Naval Academy at Annapolis was established in 1845. In the 1850's the Navy initiated shore-based schools for specialists—an educational system later enormously expanded. The Naval Academy Preparatory School and the Marine Corps Institute were established in 1920, and the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps in 4-year colleges and universities in 1925. During World War II, Dean Joseph W. Barker, special assistant to the Secretary of the Navy, declared that the Navy itself had become one huge school.

Since World War II the Navy has endeavored to adjust its educational programs for both officers and enlisted personnel to the new conditions of the nuclear age.

Under an act of April 3, 1939, the Army Air Corps was authorized to institute its own educational system. By provision of the National Security Act of 1947, the Army Air Forces became the autonomous U.S. Air Force, which has since carried on its educational programs principally through the Air Training Command, the Air University, and the Air Force Academy.

In 1876 an act of Congress initiated a policy of providing training for officers of the Coast Guard. Like the Military, Naval and Air Force Academies, the Coast Guard Academy now provides broad education for officer candidates, who at the time of graduation receive academic degrees as well as commissions.

During World War II the Federal Government carried out or promoted a number of large educational programs designed to prepare the civilian population for more effective support of the war effort.

In the National Defense Education Act of 1958 the Congress made a new and specific "declaration of policy" setting forth the purpose of the act as being that of providing "substantial assistance in various forms to individuals, and to States and their subdivisions, in order to insure trained manpower of sufficient quality and quantity to meet the national defense needs of the United States."

Education in Federal jurisdictions.—Throughout its history the Federal Government has pursued a varied policy of providing for the education of persons residing in areas under its special jurisdiction.

Land-grant colleges; civilian vocational education.—With the passage of the Morrill Act of 1862, establishing the land-grant colleges, the Congress initiated a policy of giving aid to the States for higher education in certain specialized fields; namely, agriculture and the mechanic arts. Federal programs for the promotion of vocational education of civilians have included nautical education, since 1874; in-service training of Government personnel, at least since 1879; vocational education in the public schools, since 1917; and vocational education of physically disabled persons, since 1920.

Depression-period programs.—During the economic depression of the1930's, several Federal emergency agencies carried out extensive educational activities as measures of relief to the States and localities. The Civilian Conservation Corps, the National Youth Administration, the Federal Emergency Relief Administration and the Public Works Administration played major roles in education during this period.

Education of veterans.—In 1918 the Congress provided for vocational education of disabled veterans of World War I. The Vocational Rehabilitation Act of 1943 made similar provisions for disabled veterans of World War II. The Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 authorized an educational program of unprecedented scope for practically all veterans of World War II. Later legislation has established a modified policy of providing educational benefits for veterans.

Aid to certain localities.—Just prior to our entry into World War II, the Federal Government initiated a policy of giving aid for community facilities, including schools, in areas receiving large influxes of military personnel and war workers. In two acts of 1950, since amended, the Congress established specific policies of Federal aid for education in communities particularly affected by Federal activities.

Aid for institutions and facilities.—Besides giving aid to particular non-Federal institutions (such as Howard University since 1879) the Federal Government has aided schools and colleges through its programs for the disposal of surplus property (since 1944) and loans for construction of college dormitories and other bulidings (since 1950).

Scholarships, fellowships, and traineeships.—Historical markers along the route of Federal promotion of manpower development through aid to individuals for higher education might include those for the earliest appointments to the several service academies (regarded by some persons as scholarships), and authorization of National Cancer Institute fellowships in 1937 and National Science Foundation fellowships in 1950.

International education.—In 1906 the U.S. Government began activities in the field of international education. These activities have included (1) bilateral programs of educational cooperation with other countries, (2) educational activities participated in by the Federal Government as a member of international organizations, and (3) programs for the reeducation of defeated nations in the ways of democracy after World War II.

Other policies and programs.—Some other activities indicative of the development of Federal policies affecting education before 1961 have been: (1) since 1918, promotion of education for citizenship, (2) since 1933, aid for the provision of school lunches, and (3) particularly since early in World War I, contractual arrangements with colleges and universities for research.

C. MAJOR ENACTMENTS CONCERNING EDUCATION AND TRAINING, 1961–66

The recent trend of development of Federal policies in education is shown in the following brief review of major actions by the Congress in this field during the period 1961–66.

1961.—Among other actions in this field, the Congress (1) extended the 10-title National Defense Education Act through June 30, 1964; (2) passed the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act, which provided for revision and coordination of U.S. programs in international education; and (3) established the Peace Corps, to help interested countries meet their needs for trained manpower.

1962.—Enactments included: (1) provision for payment of indirect costs of research and development contracted by the Government at universities and other educational institutions, and (2) extension of the authorization for donations of Government surplus personal property to schools for the mentally retarded, and other specified educational agencies.

1963.—The Congress extended the Federal role in education by enactment of a number of important laws, including the following, which established large programs of Federal assistance for the purposes implied in the titles, namely: (1) the Health Professions Assistance Act of 1963; (2) the Mental Retardation Facilities and Mental Health Centers Construction Act of 1963; (3) the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963; and (4) the Vocational Education Act of 1963.

1964.—The Congress (1) passed the Library Services and Construction Act; (2) extended for 2 years the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act of 1961, which contains educational provisions; (3) passed the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, containing training provisions; (4) established a National Arts Foundation; (5) extended and broadened the National Defense Education Act of 1958; (6) passed the Civil Rights Act of 1964, with several titles affecting education and training; and (7) enacted other educational and training measures.

1965.—Prominent among all laws ever passed by the Congress for the promotion of education are the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 and the Higher Education Act of 1965. These measures authorize Federal funds for a number of purposes in elementary, secondary, and higher education.

Other important 1965 laws containing educational and training features are the Manpower Act of 1965, the Older Americans Act of 1965, the Mental Health Centers Construction Act Amendments of 1965, and the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1965.

Among other aids to education and training established by the Congress in 1965 are: (1) loan insurance and direct loans to aid students to attend postsecondary business and other vocational schools; (2) scholarship grants to students in the health professions; (3) aid for construction of research facilities for new medical schools; (4) establishment of the National Foundation for the Arts and Humanities; (5) aid for developing medical libraries; and (6) aid for school construction in disaster areas.

1966.—Among more than 60 laws wholly or partly concerning education and training enacted by Congress in 1966 are: the Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1966; the Higher Education Amendments of 1966; the Manpower Development and Training Amendments of 1966; and the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1966. Other 1966 enactments include: (1) provision for educational and other benefits for veterans of service after January 31, 1955; (2) amendment of the Library Services and Construction Act; (3) authorization for the establishment of sea-grant colleges; (4) provision for facilitation of the international flow of educational, scientific, and cultural materials, (5) authorization for the Department of the Interior and for the Department of Transportation to enter into research contracts with educational institutions; and (6) educational and training provisions in the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966 and in the Allied Health Professions Personnel Training Act of 1966.

Altogether these enactments have greatly enlarged the Federal role in education since 1960.

D. THE OFFICE OF EDUCATION AND THE NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

Following is a nutshell summary of the history and present organization and functions of the two Federal agencies which have education as their primary concern.

In 1867 the Congress established a Federal "Department of Education." Subsequent action by Congress and by the President have several times changed the name of this agency and its position in the Federal structure. It is now the Office of Education in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The primary function of the Office, set forth in the establishing act, is that of collecting and disseminating information concerning education. Later acts of Congress and Executive orders have assigned the Office responsibilities for administering Federal grants-in-aid to education, cooperative research, and other functions. Particularly since 1963 the Office has grown greatly in budget and staff. Its total budget rose from approximately $700 million in 1963 to more than $3.9 billion for the fiscal year 1967.

Headed by the Commissioner of Education, the Office is now organized in seven staff and service offices, each directed by an assistant commissioner of education and five bureaus, each directed by an associate commissioner. The assistant commissioners manage the internal business of the Office and handle its relations with the Congress, other agencies, and the public press.

The associate commissioners direct the programs conducted by the bureaus. These deal with matters pertaining to (1) elementary and secondary education; (2) adult, vocational and library programs; (3) higher education; (4) education of the handicapped; and (5) research.

The National Science Foundation was established by the Congress in May 1950. The statute creating the Foundation, as amended, authorizes and directs it, among other things, "to support basic scientific research and programs to strengthen scientific research potential," "to award scholarships and graduate fellowships in the sciences," and "to foster the interchange of scientific information among scientists."

Responsibilities in addition to those set forth in the establishing act were assigned to the Foundation by the National Defense Education Act of 1958 and by the National Sea Grant College and Program Act of 1966.

The fundamental purpose of the National Science Foundation is to strengthen basic research and education in the sciences in the United States.

The Foundation consists of the National Science Board of 24 members and a Director, each appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Director is the chief executive officer of the Foundation and serves ex officio as a member of the Board and as Chairman of its executive committee.

Among the activities of the Foundation are:

1. The development and dissemination of information relating to scientific resources, including manpower, aimed at facilitating national decisions relating to strengthening the scientific effort of the Nation.
2. The award of grants and contracts primarily to universities and other nonprofit institutions in support of basic scientific research. Awards include those made for small and large research projects, for the construction of laboratories or specialized facilities, and for generally strengthening an institution's scientific endeavors. This activity also includes support of concerted research efforts that are planned, coordinated, and funded on a national program basis because of the scope of the research being performed and its relationship to national goals.
3. The support, through contracts, of national centers where large facilities are made available for the use of qualified scientists.
4. A program of research and evaluation in the field of weather and modification.
5. The award of graduate fellowships in the mathematical, physical, medical, biological, engineering, and social sciences, and the provision of support for graduate student traineeship programs at educational institutions.
6. Programs aimed at improving scientific education in the United States through providing support for: special institutes to improve the competence of teachers of science, mathematics, and engineering; projects to modernize materials of instruction and courses of study; and projects to afford opportunities for high-ability secondary school and college students to secure added scientific experiences.
7. A program aimed at strengthening research, education, and training in oceanography and exploitation of the marine environment.
8. A program aimed at improving the coordination of the various scientific information activities within the Federal Government; developing new or im-

proved methods of making scientific information available; fostering the interchange of scientific information among scientists of the United States and foreign countries; and providing support for the translation of foreign scientific information.

E. RECOMMENDATIONS OF AD HOC ADVISORY COMMISSIONS (1929–67)

For nearly 40 years, at least, various advisory commissions, convoked by action of the Congress, the President, or heads of Federal agencies, have been recommending specific Federal policies and programs in education. Concerning some components of the broad question as to what the Federal Government should or should not do in educational matters, expressions of opinion from the majority of these groups have been in impressive agreement. In general, the recommendations of these official bodies are still applicable to the present conduct of Federal educational activities.

The conclusions of these commissions have been based upon extensive research and study, usually covering a period of years. Their published reports comprise many volumes, one of the committees alone having published 21 reports and staff studies. Altogether, millions of dollars have been spent to finance these studies and reports.

Following is a brief summary of some of the broader and more significant findings, critical comments, and recommendations of these commissions. Since the language used by these groups to express similar recommendations and criticisms has varied widely, and since most of the recommendations have been made with reservations and qualifying comments, it is here emphasized that this is only a summary of the basic ideas expressed.

As early as in 1931 the National Advisory Committee on Education appointed by President Herbert Hoover drew attention to the extensiveness of Federal educational activities and to their wide dispersion throughout the Federal structure. Respecting these matters, the Advisory Committee on Education appointed by President Roosevelt, in its report published in 1938, emphasized the findings of the earlier Committee. In 1948 the task force on education appointed by the Hoover Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government reported that practically every major department and independent agency of the Federal Government was participating in educational activities.[1]

Outstanding among programs advocated in the Advisory Committee reports of 1931 and 1938 is Federal grants-in-aid to public elementary and secondary education in general, or for school construction. In supporting this kind of proposal the two Advisory Committees named have been joined by the National Resources Planning Board (1939), the White House Conference on Children in a Democracy (1939), the Committee on Planning for Education (1941), the Committee on Intergovernmental Fiscal Relations (1943), the Task Force on Public Welfare appointed by the (Hoover) Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government (1947), the Mid-

---

[1] A report entitled "Federal Educational Activities and Educational Issues Before Congress," prepared in the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress for the House Committee on Education and Labor in 1951, confirmed these findings but warned of great differences among the activities with respect to the extent of their being "educational." A similar study in 1960 entitled "Federal Educational Policies, Programs, and Proposals," set forth similar findings.

Century White House Conference on Children and Youth (1950), the White House Conference on Education (1955), and the Kennedy Task Force Committee on Education (1961).

Some of the principal adverse criticisms expressed in the reports are: (1) That the Federal Government has never established a comprehensive policy or program for its educational activities, but has initiated policies of far-reaching effect as mere incidents of some particular attempt to induce an immediate and particular efficiency; (2) that these policies are inconsistent and sometimes conflicting; (3) that there is a deplorable lack of coordination of Federal educational programs; (4) that the Federal Government has engaged in overlapping and independent promotions of curriculums in highly specialized fields while neglecting the general curricular needs of the country; and (5) that aggressive Federal agencies have promoted their causes through education without regard to overall development of education.

Recommendations of the governmental advisory commissions have not been in agreement respecting the questions of (1) whether the U.S. Office of Education should be an independent agency in the Federal structure and (2) whether the Federal educational programs should be concentrated in the Office of Education.

Over a period of years various advisory groups affiliated with national nongovernmental organizations interested in education have added their voices to those of the governmental commissions named in the preceding comments. The nongovernmental bodies have likewise arrived at their conclusions through extensive study and deliberations, and have published voluminous reports. Following is a summary of what appear to be the more significant and basic criticisms and recommendations expressed in these reports. For a consideration of the exact language used and qualifying comments made by any one of the groups, the reader may refer to chapter 5 of this report.

As in the case of the governmental advisory commissions, the nongovernmental groups have been most united in their support of the principle of Federal financial aid to the States for education. The following groups have joined in recommending a program of this kind: The National Conference on the Financing of Education (1933), the American Youth Commission (1940), the National Committee on Coordination in Secondary Education (1941), the Educational Policies Commission and the Problems and Policies Committee (joint report, 1945), the National Citizens Commission for the Public Schools (1954), and the President's Commission on National Goals (1960).

While these nongovernmental commissions have concerned themselves principally with the issue of Federal aid to the States for education, several of them have included in their reports recommendations, in substance, (1) that educational leadership, as distinguished from educational control, should be established as a proper and major function of the Federal Government, and (2) that the Federal Government should establish a clear-cut policy defining its relations to education.

Criticisms advanced by one or another of these commissions have included the following ideas: (1) That very bad educational conditions have been allowed to develop in some localities of the United States because of dependence upon local property taxation for school support; (2) that a large number of Federal agencies have been carrying out their educational programs independently rather than as part of an adequately integrated, national educational effort; and (3) that piecemeal Federal legislation to meet educational problems has been hasty, indirect, and expensive, and has resulted in Federal controls over education.

F. POSITIONS OF CURRENTLY ACTIVE GOVERNMENTAL BODIES AND PRIVATE ORGANIZATIONS

In addition to the ad hoc commissions already named, many presently active organizations and agencies, governmental and nongovernmental, have recently expressed their views concerning existing and proposed educational programs. Their opinions have been voiced through policy statements, resolutions, and other media. The extent to which these expressions represent the attitudes of the constituent members of the organizations and agencies varies considerably. However, the material concerning the attitudes of organizations included in the present study generally indicates to some significant degree the opinions of their respective constituencies.

Following is a summary of relevant expressions of opinion emanating from a number of organizations and agencies which represent various cross sections of American life and which have taken an interest in matters dealt with in this report. In assuming positions with respect to these matters most of these groups have expressed qualifying considerations. Therefore, it is not feasible to summarize their positions except in relation to what appear to be the most basic ideas. Generally the following statement should be taken as only loosely indicative of the attitudes of these bodies. For a fuller statement of the position of any organization or agency the reader is invited to turn to chapter 6 of this report.

The Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has proposed (in 1967): Amendments to and extension of (1) the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965; (2) the Higher Education Act of 1965; (3) the National Defense Education Act of 1958; and (4) the Educational Television Facilities Act of 1962. The Office has also proposed provisions for education for the public service.

The National Science Foundation supports Federal policies and programs to promote (1) adequate preparation of science teachers; (2) bringing up to date the content of science curricula; (3) financial aid to graduate science students; and (4) aid to institutions of higher education in scientific fields.

The educational issue concerning which the largest number of currently active organizations and agencies included in this study have expressed themselves is that of Federal financial aid to the States for elementary and secondary education in general. Among organizations and agencies which have in some manner expressed support for the principle of such aid, or for a particular proposal of this kind, are the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations; the American Association of School Administrators; the Department of Elementary School Principals (National Education Association); the National School Boards Association; the National Association of Secondary School Principals; the Congress of Industrial Organizations;

the National Council of Churches of Christ in the United States of America; the United Presbyterian Church in the United States of America; the American Library Association; the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development; the Educational Policies Commission; and the National Education Association.

Organizations which have expressed opposition to the principle of Federal grants-in-aid to States for elementary and secondary education in general includes the American Farm Bureau Federation; the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, and the National Association of Manufacturers.

A number of organizations have either expressed favor of Federal aid to public education only, or have directly expressed or implied opposition to Federal aid to nonpublic or parochial schools. Among these organizations are: Americans United for Separation of Church and State; the American Association of School Administrators; the Department of Elementary School Principals, National Education Association; the National Association of Secondary School Principals; the National School Boards Association; the National Farmers Union; the American Association for Jewish Education; the United Presbyterian Church in the United States of America; the Association of Classroom Teachers, of the National Education Association; the National Congress of Parents and Teachers; and the National Education Association.

A number of organizations and agencies have urged, in substance, that Federal-aid-to-education programs be administered without Federal control, through the U.S. Office of Education and the appropriate State educational agencies, in accordance with State policies.

One or more of the currently active organizations and agencies included in this study have expressed approval of the basic idea that the Congress (or the Federal Government):

1. Expand Federal participation in financing vocational education.
2. Continue or expand Federal categorical grants-in-aid to education.
3. Improve coordination of Federal grant programs being administered through a number of Federal agencies.
4. Establish an educational opportunity bank to lend money to post-secondary students.
5. Coordinate all types of Federal support for graduate training.
6. Establish a foreign service career system.
7. Refrain from establishing a national pupil testing program or a national curriculum.
8. Uphold the concept of "the neighborhood school."
9. Provide for administration of educational programs through educational agencies.
10. Question the advisability of increasing the operational functions of the (U.S.) Office of Education.
11. Provide Federal aid for construction or remodeling of public schools.
12. Establish a means of resolving the constitutional question of utilizing public funds for nonpublic educational programs.
13. Continue the National Teacher Corps on an experimental basis.
14. Wherever possible, vest educational functions and authority in State departments of education.

15. Make guidelines for school desegregation uniformly applicable throughout the Nation.
16. Establish an expanded program of scholarships, work-study grants and guaranteed loans for students.
17. Provide tax credits for college education expenses.
18. Continue selective aids to higher education.
19. Overhaul all Federal grant-in-aid programs.
20. Provide Federal funds to further the establishment of community junior colleges.
21. Preserve local control over education.
22. Provide for sharing Federal revenue as a substitute for Federal grants-in-aid.
23. Provide "strong and sustained" Federal financial support to higher education.
24. Establish a Federal Department of Education.
25. Provide for judicial review of the constitutionality of education legislation.

Other proposals, and expressions of opposition to some measures, are expressed by currently active organizations and agencies in chapter 6 of this report.

APPENDIX

TEXTS OF THE DEMOCRATIC AND REPUBLICAN PARTY PLATFORM PLANKS ON EDUCATION, 1968

Following is the text of the plank on education in the platform adopted by the Democratic National Convention in Chicago, Ill., on August 28, 1968:

Education.—Education is the chief instrument for making good the American promise. It is indispensable to every man's chance to achieve his full potential. We will seek to open education to all Americans.

We will assure equal opportunity to education and equal access to high-quality education. Our aim is to maintain State-local control over the Nation's educational system, with Federal financial assistance and help in stimulating changes through demonstration and technical assistance. New concepts of education and training employing new communications technology must be developed to educate children and adults.

Every citizen has a basic right to as much education and training as he desires and can master—from preschool through graduate studies—even if his family cannot pay for this education.

We will marshal our national resources to help develop and finance new and effective methods of dealing with the educationally disadvantaged—including expanded preschool programs to prepare all young children for full participation in formal education, improved teacher recruitment, and training programs for inner city and rural schools, the Teachers Corps, assistance to community controlled schools to encourage pursuit of innovative practices, university participation in research and operation of school programs, a vocational education system that will provide imaginative new ties between school and the world of work, and improved and more widespread adult education programs.

We will fully fund title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, which provides Federal funds for improving education in schools serving large numbers of students from low-income families.

The financial burden of education continues to grow as enrollments spiral and costs increase. The homeowner's property tax burden must be eased by increased levels of financial aid by both the States and the Federal Government.

Our rapidly expanding educational frontiers require a redoubling of efforts to insure the vitality of a diverse higher education system—public and private, large and small, community and junior colleges and great universities. We also pledge support for high-quality graduate and medical education.

We will enlarge the Federal scholarship program to remove the remaining financial barriers to postsecondary education for low-income youths, and increase assistance to students in the form of repayable loans out of future income.

We will encourage support for the arts and the humanities, through the national foundations established by a Democratic Congress to provide incentives for those endowed with extraordinary talent, enhance the quality of our life, and make productive leisure available to all our people.

We recommend greater stress on the arts and humanities in elementary and secondary curriculums to insure a proper educational balance.

Following is the text of the plank on education in the platform adopted by the Republican National Convention at Miami Beach, Fla., on August 6, 1968:

Education.—The birthplace of American opportunity has been in the classrooms of our schools and colleges. From early childhood through the college years, American schools must offer programs of education sufficiently flexible to meet the needs of all Americans—the advantaged, the average, the disadvantaged, and the handicapped alike. To help our educators meet this need we will establish a National Commission to Study the Quality and Relevance of American Education.

To treat the special problems of children from impoverished families, we advocate expanded, better programs for preschool children. We will encourage State, local, or private programs of teacher training. The development and increased use of better teaching methods and modern instruction techniques such as educational television and voluntary bilingual education will continue to have our support.

To help assure excellence and equality of educational opportunity, we will urge the States to present plans for Federal assistance which would include State distribution of such aid to non-public-school children and include non-public-school representatives in the planning process. Where State conditions prevent use of funds for non-public-school children, a public agency should be designated to administer Federal funds.

Greater vocational education in high school and post-high-school years is required for a new technological and service-oriented economy. Young people need expansion of post-high-school technical institutes to enable them to acquire satisfactory skills for meaningful employment. For youths unable to obtain such training, we propose an industry youth program, coupled with a flexible approach to minimum wage laws for young entry-level workers during their training periods.

The rapidly mounting enrollments and costs of colleges and universities deprive many qualified young people of the opportunity to obtain a quality college education. To help colleges and universities provide this opportunity, we favor grant and loan programs for expansion of their facilities. We will also support a flexible student aid program of grants, loans, and work opportunities, provided by Federal and State governments and private organizations. We continue to favor tax credits and also tax deductions to encourage savings for this purpose. No young American should be denied a quality education because he cannot afford it or find work to meet its costs.

○

ERIC Clearinghouse
MAR 20 1969
on Adult Education